

CHICAGO HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Chicago and the Region

Books and Manuscripts

Archives

LIBRARY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFER, 1883; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1937

H. Shelton Smith	President	Robert S. Michaelson	Asst. Sec.
George H. Williams	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. H. Nichols	Editor
(Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York)			

OTHER VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sandford Fleming	Quirinus Breen
Sidney E. Mead	Robert T. Handy
Carl E. Schneiders	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Trinerend	Harold J. Grimm

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Roland H. Barnton
William Walker Rockwell	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winfred E. Garrison	Horatio S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moehlmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loescher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Fauck	Ernest G. Schwiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petty

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 7, Ill.

The articles in *Church History* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *Church History*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School, Yale University*)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School, University of Chicago*)
ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School, University of Chicago*)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Meadville Theological School*)
RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke University*)
MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theological Seminary*)
WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological Seminary*)
JOHN DILLENBERGER (*Divinity School, Harvard University*)
EDWARD A. DOWNEY, JR. (*McCormick Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXVI

MARCH, 1957

No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

JOHN CALVIN AND THE RHETORICAL TRADITION <i>Quirinus Breen</i>	3
NATIONALISM AND MISSIONS <i>R. Pierce Beaver</i>	22
CHILIASM AND THE HUSSITE REVOLUTION <i>Howard Kaminsky</i>	43
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	72
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL	76
MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY	77
REPORT OF THE TREASURER	78

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

79

GÖRANSSON, SVEN: *Ortodoxi och synkretism i Sverige, 1647-1660* Edgar M. Carlson

GÖRANSSON, SVEN: *Den synkretistiska striden i Sverige, 1660-1664* Edgar M. Carlson

MILBURN, R. L. P.: *Early Christian Interpretations of History* Noah E. Fehl

SUELFLOW, AUGUST R.: *The Heart of Missouri* Martin E. Marty

WOOD, SUSAN: *English Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* Ray C. Petry

WENDEL, FRANÇOIS, ED.: *De Regno Christi, Martini Buceri Opera Latina* Edward A. Dowey, Jr.

RENAUDET, AUGUSTIN: *Erasme et l'Italie* Quirinus Breen

REIDY, MAURICE F.: *Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher* Percy V. Norwood

PAYNE, ERNEST A.: *James Henry Rushbrooke, 1870-1947: A Baptist Greatheart* Robert T. Handy

SLOSSER, GAIUS JACKSON, ED.: *They Seek a Country. The American Presbyterians* T. Watson Street

SWEET, WILLIAM WARREN: *Virginia Methodism: A History* Walter B. Posey

BRAITHWAITE, WILLIAM C.: *The Beginnings of Quakerism* T. D. Seymour Bassett

SUNDKLER, BENGT: *Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union 1900-1947* Joseph M. Kitagawa

WENTZ, ABDEL ROSS: *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* Martin E. Marty

TORBET, ROBERT G.: *Venture of Faith: The Story of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 1814-1954* R. Pierce Beaver

ARMSTRONG, MAURICE W., LOETSCHER, LEFFERTS A., AND ANDERSON, CHARLES S., EDs.: *The Presbyterian Enterprise, Sources of American Presbyterian History* Clifford M. Drury

OLIPHANT, J. ORIN, ED.: *Through the South and the West with Jeremiah Evarts in 1826* Walter B. Posey

JOHN CALVIN AND THE RHETORICAL TRADITION*

QUIRINUS BREEN, *University of Oregon*

The purpose of this essay is to bring another candle to an understanding of John Calvin as a theologian, by way of a look at some rhetorical traits¹ in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. That Calvin was an eminent theologian or that the *Institutes* is a classic of theological literature is not examined, for neither is generally disputed. Our specific concern is with the question of what happens to theological subject matter when it is put in rhetorical form. Accordingly, this essay is divided into three parts: I—The proper marks of a style suitable to theology, and how the humanists, including Calvin, felt about this; II—A look at some rhetorical traits in the *Institutes*; and III—Some conclusions.

I.

First, then, the proper marks of a style suitable to theology, and how the humanists, including Calvin, felt about this. It is of no moment whether one says philosophical style or theological style, for these two are blood brothers. It is necessary to enlarge on this.

Speaking broadly, philosophy is the love of wisdom, and theology is the love of a revealed religion. Just as philosophy is an intellectual love of wisdom, so theology is an intellectual love of a revealed religion. A crucial fact is that philosophy is not the wisdom itself, and that theology is not the revealed religion itself. Philosophy is a discourse about wisdom, and theology is a discourse about a revealed religion. In both it is an intellectual discourse. The delight one takes in both pertains to the life of the mind. The intellectual joy to be found in each can make of both, like the arts and sciences, a universal possession.

Again saying it broadly, theology is a revelation speaking in the language of philosophy.² According to Professor Harry A. Wolfson, this originated in the encounter of Judaism with Hellenism, and found its first effective voice in Philo Judaeus.³ The object was not so much to prove to believers that revelation is true, as it was to show to the philosophers that revelation is a greater wisdom than unrevealed wisdom. The difference between the wisdom which the philosophers love and the wisdom which the believers in revelation love is a difference of addition. For example, to human wisdom's belief in God's providence revealed wisdom added the belief of God as Creator, in the sense

*Presidential address, delivered before the American Society of Church History, December 1956, in St. Louis.

that He created the world out of nothing. Again, to the belief of a strict order of nature was added the belief of miracle, in the sense of God's interrupting the regular course of nature. One more illustration: to human wisdom's belief that the only source of all knowledge is human reason, there was added that the most important source is divine revelation reported in a holy book. The significance of all such addition is that intellectual discourse about human wisdom was augmented by intellectual discourse about revealed wisdom. Theology was added to philosophy.

Now this addition was not like a sum in arithmetic. It was rather like an incarnation. Theology was incarnated in philosophy. Through this incarnation theology took on the form of philosophy. Therefore the style of philosophy is also the style of theology. "Philosophical" and "theological" are therefore interchangeable terms so far as style of discourse is concerned.

What is the proper style of theological and philosophical discourse? Ideally it is syllogistic, or geometric. Actually and historically it has not used this ideal style nearly as much as it has used others. The poetical form was used by Parmenides, Cleanthes, Lucretius, Solomon Ibn Gabirol, Dante, and Bruno. The proverb or gnomic saying was used by the early wise men of Greece and by the authors of the Book of Proverbs, and was used also by Spinoza. Plato wrote in dialogue form, as did the writer of the Book of Job, and it can be found in Erigena, Abailard, Leo Hebraeus, Galileo, and again in Spinoza. A great deal of philosophical literature is in the form of exegesis of Scripture, such as in the Haggadic Midrashim, in Philo, and the Church Fathers; it continues throughout medieval times, and is used also by Spinoza. The autobiographical form is found in Descartes and Spinoza. The problems of philosophy are discussed in letters, as in Cicero, Seneca, Maimonides, Descartes, and Spinoza. All this information comes from Professor Wolfson.⁴ He does not include rhetorical discourse in this particular paragraph, though he might well have done so.

Since rhetorical style is our special concern, it is useful to point out that rhetorical traits are present in some of the forms of discourse mentioned above. There is a considerable homiletical strain in Lucretius; the argument is weighted by his appeal to man's desire to be free from the fear of death. In Plato's dialogues a presumption in favor of the matter at hand is created by the manner of Socrates. Descartes' personal experience gives to the *Discourse on Method* a dramatic force that lends impressiveness to his reasoning.

It must be said, however, that no form or method or style of philosophical discourse need necessarily invalidate the philosophical character of the writing. This holds for rhetorical form as well as that of

poetry, gnomic saying, dialogue, exegesis, autobiography, or letters. The spirit of intellectual inquiry can be genuine under any of these guises. On the other hand, the spirit of intellectual inquiry may be lacking from discourse in syllogistic or geometric form. The history of philosophical composition should instruct one not to require forms of discourse which eliminate a philosophical writing by a Lucretius or Plato, or Cicero, or Descartes from the canon of philosophy. "There is no logical connection between the contents of a philosophy and the particular literary form in which it is written."⁵

But rhetorical form—like poetical, autobiographical, and other forms—does tend to distract from the pure intellectual quest. The form most suitable to philosophy is one that is as literal and plain as possible, that wears no metaphor, has no breath of persuasion, and makes no dramatic gesture. The plainest style is the syllogistic, of which variations are the geometric and the symbolic. It is clean of figure, persuasion, and gesture. The syllogistic style and its variations have a long history, beginning notably with Aristotle's *Analytics*. The Stoics had a logic which aimed at even more precision. There are elements of geometric composition in Porphyry and Proclus, in Maimonides and other Jewish writers, in Moslems like Avicenna and Averroes, and in the Christian Alanus de Insulis (Nicolaus of Amiens). The syllogism was especially cultivated by the Scholastics.⁶

Since classical times there has been a conflict of philosophy and rhetoric, not to speak now of other forms of discourse. The conflict has been more prominent between philosophy and rhetoric than other styles. The most celebrated illustration was the clash of Plato's Socrates with the Sophists. It was carried forward—on a higher plane for the Sophists—by Aristotle and Isocrates. Cicero deplored all this. He protested eloquently in his *De Oratore* that wisdom (philosophy) and rhetoric should live in wedlock. He says they once were indeed wedded, but that Socrates—paradoxically a man of great eloquence—separated them; that Plato—the most eloquent of all Greeks—widened the breach; and that Aristotle continued what Socrates and Plato had done.⁷ He says in effect that since then philosophy had tended to lose touch with the practical issues of life, and that rhetoric had tended to lack the substance which comes from wisdom; philosophy tended to be an esoteric jargon, rhetoric tended toward empty loquacity. Their separation therefore is unnatural; they should again be wedded. The attractiveness of this Ciceronian "reform" endured long. St. Augustine, preparing himself for the rhetorical profession, read Cicero's *Hortensius* which praised wisdom. This was the first influence stimulating him to seek wisdom. Though the *Hortensius* is lost, it is unlikely that its notion of wisdom was other than that of the *De Oratore*. Practically everything St. Augustine wrote bears the mark of the rhetorician. The

greatest philosophical work of Boethius is *The Consolation of Philosophy*, in which rhetorical traits are conspicuous. But his influence on the schools was eventually to give prominence to dialectic rather than to grammar and rhetoric; which came from his transmission of Porphyry's *Isagogics* and Aristotle's *Categories* and *On Interpretation* (the only Aristotelian works available till the 12th century). The taste for philosophy as a subject matter for disputation became so keen that in high Scholasticism syllogistic discourse was practically universal. Philosophy and rhetoric were again divorced.

During the Renaissance there was a reaction against the syllogistic form of the Scholastics.⁸ To quote Professor Wolfson again, "The Renaissance philosophers had an aversion toward the syllogistic method of the medievals, not so much on intellectual grounds as on purely aesthetic grounds, . . . because it was bare and bleak and skeleton-like. They were dissatisfied with the syllogism for the same reason that people are displeased with food that is merely nourishment, with clothes that are merely warm, or with a house that is merely a shelter. . . . [The Renaissance philosophers] therefore began to experiment with new literary forms, more polished, more refined, and more resonant—dialogues after the manner of Plato, poetry after the manner of Lucretius, and rhetorical prose after the manner of Cicero."⁹

In general this seems a fair assessment of Renaissance philosophical style. What is said of writing in "rhetorical prose after the manner of Cicero" is, speaking broadly, true of Calvin's *Institutes*. But to call him a Ciceronian can invite misunderstanding. First, in his time Ciceronianism pertained to the conscious imitation of Cicero as exemplified by Bembo, Sadoleto, and in extreme form by Longolius. Calvin betrays no anxious care to copy Cicero. He seems indeed to have been fond of Cicero, for his references to him increase with the years, but he never breathes a hint of trying to write like him. As a matter of fact, when he mentions his own style it is rather to intimate that he has a style of his own.¹⁰ Second, the style of the Bible attracted him more than any other. To my knowledge he does not say he imitates it; perhaps his piety would not have permitted him even to consider it seriously. However, he praises the manner of the Bible above all others. He speaks of its concern with "dignity of subject matter rather than charming language (verborum gratia)." There is in it no utter lack of eloquence, for sometimes "speech flows sweet and pleasant (suavis et incunda fluit oratio), as in David and Isaiah." But for the most part the style is "unpolished and plain (rudi et crasso stylo)." But throughout Scripture, even when the form is homely and rustic, there is conspicuous the majesty of the Spirit. Calvin's thrust is to body forth this majesty, so far as it can be done without the inspiration under which he believed the Bible writers had written. There are sublime

pages in Calvin. He is conscious of the awesomeness of God's immediate presence, and he cannot read the Bible without hearing the very voice of the Omnipotent. How could his writing have been bare of exaltation! The *Institutes* has many pages which thunder with indignation against the stupidity of the "natural" man for thinking and speaking and living in a way that betrays no such awe for God and His Word. This indignation is so frequent and often so long sustained that his style has been called somber, or even "triste."¹¹ Had Calvin ever heard this characterization of his style his comment might have been to the effect that Scripture has no light moments to give to the unbelieving. All this is decidedly not Ciceronian.

However, recognizing what is unique in Calvin, he nevertheless moves in the Ciceronian tradition. But it is a dynamic Ciceronianism. He follows the principle of Cicero's "reform," to wit, that wisdom must go hand in hand with eloquence. This kind of Ciceronianism need not be anxious to use only Cicero's vocabulary and sentence structure; it leaves one free to emulate any style, or to emulate none, and to develop one's own. This dynamic Ciceronianism was championed by Marius Nizolius, an Italian contemporary of Calvin.¹² But Calvin did not get it from Nizolius, for Nizolius did not publish his book till 1553, well after Calvin's style was fully developed. The question whence he got the idea of his form must remain unanswered here, for I cannot say. One can suspect that Melanchthon had something to do with it; but this needs investigation. To this I can attest: while reading Nizolius' *De veris principiis* the thought frequently intruded that Calvin had already practised what Nizolius later preached, to wit, the Ciceronian doctrine that philosophy must not be divorced from eloquence or rhetoric, that the only natural and fruitful relation between them is marriage.¹³

The metaphor of marriage can be put to good use by asking which one proposes marriage. Does philosophy propose to rhetoric, or rhetoric to philosophy? Either may happen. In Cicero it is rhetoric that proposes, and it is so again in the Renaissance humanists. Barbaro rather than Pico epitomizes it. Melanchthon, defending Barbaro and even strengthening the latter's Reply to Pico, explicitly proposes that philosophy cast her lot with rhetoric.¹⁴ And Calvin, never very far from Melanchthon, does the same.

A word may be said to suggest Calvin's mind on this matter. As a young scholar he can as it were be thought of as a rhetor in search of a subject matter. This can help explain his Seneca commentary. As a piece in the mirror-of-princes genre the *De Clementia* has rhetorical form. If Calvin did indeed intend by his commentary to influence the king, it was so subtle that no man can say for certain that he intended this. How different it is when he finds the Protestant gospel! Here

was something that induced in him a unique religious experience of adoration,¹⁵ and this, in turn, develops themes suitable to epideictic discourse. In fact, it can be said that praise and dispraise are his warp and weft. This Protestant gospel gave him an audience, a reading public, which in intention embraced all men. This constituted a setting suited to deliberative discourse. That is, he is an orator bent on persuading men to accept the Protestant way of faith and life as he sees it. Too, Calvin found this gospel at a time when its adherents were persecuted. This awoke in him the spirit of the defense attorney, with the effect that the very frame-work of the *Institutes* marks it as forensic discourse. These—epideictic, deliberative, forensic—are the three kinds of rhetorical discourse, and they all characterize the *Institutes*.

Another word should be said to intercept a possible suspicion that Calvin wrote with the rhetorical textbooks of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian on his desk for constant reference. He knew these masters, and doubtless other ancients, as well as a number of his own era. But he plays the scores by ear, and some parts he disdains altogether. Indeed, he persistently violates a basic rule of rhetoric in that he seldom if ever tries to persuade by pleasing the reader either in what he says or how he says it. Were one to name the most constant excellence of Calvin, it could well be that of vividness; he tries his utmost to keep the reader awake.

II.

We now come to some rhetorical traits in the *Institutes*.

As was said, the *Institutes* has characteristics of each of the three kinds of rhetorical discourse: epideictic, deliberative, and forensic. I put epideictic first, for it seems congruous with Calvin's religious experience. Epideictic is discourse of encomium and vituperation, or of praise and blame. We are exposed to much of it during election campaigns. A more serious and more generally appreciated form of epideictic is found in the Book of Psalms, in the hymns of the church, and in many kinds of prayers. Calvin's epideictic pertains to such themes as the praise of God's majesty in his creation and providence, and of this self-disclosure in Scripture; it pertains to themes such as the denunciation of man's vanity and arrogance and of his false imaginings about moral freedom.

Book I, v. 1-8¹⁶ praises God's creation and government. The paragraphs are arrayed in the finest doxological passages from Scripture. So much does nature body forth the glory of God that, for the moment, Calvin allows a pantheistic expression, "nature is God," which (he writes) "can be said with piety provided it proceeds from a pious mind" (par. 5). However insignificant man is when compared with God, yet God devotes his full attention to his direction: "Really,

then, do the treasures of heavenly wisdom come all on the run (concurrent) to direct the worm five feet long?" (par. 4). Paragraphs 1-8 have a concluding statement in par. 9: "We see there is no need to give long and toilsome pointers on the digging out of proofs (*testimonia*) as helps in illumining and declaring the divine majesty. We have selected a few, and no matter on which ones you fix, it is evident that they are so much in plain sight and so readily approached that with ease the eyes can trace them and the fingers mark them out. As we have observed before (I, ii, 2) we are invited to a knowledge of God, not one that is content with empty speculation and that flits to and fro in the brain, but to a knowledge which will be firm and yield fruit and, if rightly understood, strikes root in the heart. For by his excellencies is the Lord manifested; we feel their potency in us and we enjoy their benefits; and therefore this knowledge of necessity affects us far more spiritedly than if we should imagine a god of whom no feeling (*sensus*) comes through (*perveniret*) to us. Thence we understand that for seeking God the straightest road and the best-readied course is this: not to attempt by bold curiosity to penetrate His essence, which is rather to be adored than too exactly investigated; but we should carefully observe (*contemplemur*) Him in his works, and by these He returns Himself (*reddit*) near and intimate (*familiarem*) to us. . . ."¹⁷

Bk. II, Ch. II, paragraphs 13-16, is in praise of God's common grace to all men. A noble passage is paragraph 15. Bk. II, iii, 2 and 3, is a denunciation of the fallen nature of man, in which he enlarges on St. Paul's terrible indictment of man in Romans 3:10-18.

Let this be enough of epideictic.¹⁸

The second genre of rhetorical discourse in Calvin is deliberative. It can be said that, taking all, the *Institutes* as such is deliberative. Its intent is to persuade the readers to accept Calvin's version of the Christian religion. If there are epideictic elements in it, and also forensic, they are subordinate to the total deliberative end of moving one to acceptance of its message. The counterpart of persuasion is dissuasion, of which there is much in Calvin. Deliberative discourse addresses itself to people in general and not to an esoteric group. That is, the people addressed are not specially trained to understand it. A mathematician is trained to follow an intricate discourse on irrational numbers; a philosopher, to understand a complicated paper on symbolic logic; a theologian, to grasp a complicated train of reasoning about God's being and existence. All this kind of thing is needless for deliberative discourse. The man in the street, granting that he has a general education, can follow it. What is more, he can judge it; in fact, he is its judge, as Aristotle would say.

One of the most important facets of the *Institutes* is precisely that people in general are addressed and that they are its judge. In

his Letter to the Reader (1559) Calvin addresses the readers with only the adjective "pious"; there is no other qualification. He says: "Now I am sure that I have given what should be tested by your judgment of all things (quod vestro omnium iudicio probetur)." His "mind is deeply devoted to the zealous promotion of something useful to all (publicae utilitatis)." Furthermore, he "intends by this edition so to prepare and instruct candidates of theology for reading the divine word that they can have an easy access (facilem aditum) to it (the Bible). . . . And whoever properly sticks to it (the *Institutes*), to him it should not be difficult to establish both what particularly he ought to look for in the Scriptures and to what end to refer whatever is contained in them." So far Calvin has in effect called the reader a judge of all things (at least, as regards his book); he has said that he aims at something useful for everybody, and that theological students will find the Scriptures easy to interpret with the help of his book.

This leads to what follows in the Letter to the Reader. "Accordingly," he continues, "the way has now been paved, as it were, and in the expositions of Scripture later to be published I will always compress them in brief form, because I shall not hold it necessary to provide long disputationes about dogmas and to roam about in commonplaces. By this method the pious reader will be sustained amid great irksomeness and weariness (magna molestia et fastidio . . . sublevabitur): provided he comes fore-armed by the knowledge in this present work, as it were by a necessary instrument." All this appears to imply that the commentaries are the easier to use, the *Institutes* the harder; that the long disputationes and the roaming about in commonplaces are done in the *Institutes*, so that one need not expect such difficult materials in the commentaries. Now this might raise the expectation that the *Institutes* is, by comparison, learnedly hard reading, perhaps even theologically technical.

To be sure, the *Institutes* is a systematic and coherent work, while the commentaries go from topic to topic as required by the text of the Bible. But Calvin restricts the subject matter of theology to what is useful¹⁹ for the common pious reader. Accordingly there is much that he leaves out. Bk I, ii, 2 says, "They play with cold speculations only, who propose to dwell on this question: What is God (quid sit Deus)? while we rather concern ourselves to know: What is He like (qualis sit)? and to know: What is agreeable to His nature?" This is followed by, "What purpose does one attain (quorsum enim attinet) to confess with Epicurus that there is a God who, having rejected the care for the world, enjoys himself only in repose?" Furthermore, "of what help is it (quid iuvat) to know a God with whom we have nothing to carry on (nihil negotii)?" Now "quid sit" and "qualis sit" are technical terms in scholastic theology, and many scholastics considered it im-

portant to examine the "what" very carefully. But Calvin considers the subject "cold," and the concern with it he calls "play." In a passage quoted before²⁰ he spoke against attempting "by bold curiosity to penetrate God's essence, which is rather to be adored than too exactly investigated." In Bk I, vii, 4 he says, "They put first things last (praepostere faciunt) who strive earnestly to build onto (adstruere) the firm faith in Scripture by disputation. Indeed my strength does not lie in expert readiness, nor in eloquence, but . . ."—and here he says that if he were to refute hostile critics of Scripture, he would have "no difficulty." But this will never induce true faith, so what is the use!

This is enough to show that Calvin writes for the common man of general education, and that he expressly avoids subject matters which require special training. This is a true benchmark of deliberative discourse. What this means for the method of reasoning will be touched on later.²¹

The *Institutes* is also a forensic discourse, which is the kind used in the court room. The attorneys for prosecution and defense both use it. Now it is a fact that Calvin often assumes the manner of a prosecutor in his book. There is Bk. III, iv, "How Far from the Purity of the Gospel is Whatever the Sophists Chatter in Their Schools about Penitence . . ."²² The title itself is worthy of a prosecutor. So, too, is the cross-examination of witnesses (the defendants' authorities); and the satire in attacking Innocent III's law about confession.²³ "And so," says Calvin, ". . . Innocent III imposed the necessity of confession. I keep still about the times; the barbarous language alone (sola verborum barbaries) annuls confidence in the law. For the good fathers ordained that everyone of both sexes (omnem utriusque sexus) . . . must confess once a year; therefore, the wits take it to say that this precept applies to hermaphrodites only, and concerns no one who is either male or female."²⁴

There is, however, a more conspicuous reason for thinking of the *Institutes* as forensic discourse in the relation of the book to the Letter Dedicatory to King Francis I.²⁵ This letter was printed in front of all the editions of the *Institutes*, so that the two are one complete whole. In the Letter Calvin says that originally he intended to write only a book of Christian instruction, particularly for "our Frenchmen." However, when he saw to what extent the enemies of his faith were making it unsafe in France, it seemed that he would perform a valuable service if he should "by this same book give to them (the people) a book of instruction (institutionem) and to publish in your presence a confession (confessionem apud te ederem)." This last expression can be clarified by a passage in the Roman law. The Digest (Bk. II, Title 13, section 1) has a heading "De edendo" (concerning publishing, promulgating), and says: "If anyone wishes to bring an action, he

ought to publish it (eam edere); for it seems most equitable that one who is about to bring an action should publish the action, so that equally the defendant may know whether he ought to yield or contest." The expression "in your presence (apud te)," combined with "to publish an action (actionem edere)," makes it mean, to publish an action in the king's presence as judge. So we have here a metaphor of the court room. Calvin is, as it were, bringing suit against the detractors and persecutors of the Reformed faith. And so, also in this more comprehensive sense the *Institutes* is forensic discourse.²⁶

III.

Another set of rhetorical traits has to do with proof. How are propositions proved in rhetoric or the art of persuasion? There are three kinds of rhetorical proof: ethical, pathetic, and logical. I am somewhat diffident about discussing these points, inasmuch as my inductions relative to the *Institutes* are inadequate. But I hope to say enough to suggest that a study of Calvin in the light of rhetorical proof can be fruitful.

Ethical²⁷ proof derives from the character of the speaker. The speech or writing must carry the conviction that the maker of it is worthy of attention. The conviction must derive primarily from the writing at hand. A statement in the Letter to the Reader, cited above, is relevant. His loyalty to the Protestant faith had been questioned in imperial circles, and Calvin offers his final edition of the *Institutes* as proof of his steadfastness. Indeed, on no essential point did he change, from the first edition (1536) to the last (1559). This loyalty was the more important because the Letter Dedicatory to King Francis had signed Calvin as the most prominent defender of the Protestant faith. He had consistently acted as a friend who would never leave his own in the lurch. This would add considerably to his persuasive power.²⁸

It was likewise felt that Calvin was not seeking worldly gain from his position. There were many who imputed to him lust for power, but this charge has been made against many statesmen from Pericles to Lincoln. In any case, it was for all to see that Calvin possessed no wealth. Accordingly, his insinuations and often accusations against the opponents of being financially interested in their faith would tend to strengthen his own prestige. In III, iv, 7 he speaks of the "pope's hired pettifoggers."²⁹ III, v, i, speaks of the "pope and his bull-bearers . . . conducting profitable markets."³⁰

Perhaps the strongest aspect of ethical proof in the *Institutes* is its subject matter, and this in turn reflects the author. The compulsion with which Calvin brings the readers to regard themselves as in the immediate presence of God, suggests that he himself experiences this.

The subject matter is on the whole lofty and its presentation often rises to great dignity; it can scarcely be read without a feeling of respect for the writer as a man fully one with his book. The *Institutes* is in its way tied as closely to Calvin as the *Confessions* to St. Augustine.³¹

Pathetic proof derives from the writer's emotional involvement in his message. It is still a common notion that emotion and the man Calvin are incompatibles. Those who have read more or less extensively and attentively in the *Institutes* know better. Beginning with the Letter Dedicatory, one can sense deep feeling in the man for his faith and cause. A reading of the book itself for documentation of pathetic proof yields a good harvest. The method of procedure is important, and deserves a word. To establish that Calvin is emotionally involved one must not draw on materials outside of the *Institutes*. The difference between being a man of feeling and a man who uses pathetic proof is considerable.

We come to logical proof. It is an almost universal opinion that Calvin was a master of logic. Dr. Paul Hutchinson³² reflects it when he calls him a "wispy French intellectual with an introspective, syllogistic mind like that of Thomas Aquinas"; who "gave to Protestantism theological coherence"; whose *Institutes* "is as remorselessly logical as Aquinas' *Summa*." Thus the assumption is that Calvin's reasoning is "syllogistic" and "logical," which intimates that his logic is syllogistic logic. This raises the mental image of Calvin reasoning from a major premise and a minor premise to a conclusion; and that since the major and minor premises are true the conclusion must be true. We are led to think that Calvin has caught the reader in a net from which escape is impossible. A favorite figure is that his logic is an iron logic, which can suggest that it holds the mind as in a vise from which there is no release. This general opinion would justify itself by reference to a certain consistency of Calvin with respect to double predestination and the bondage of the will; also by the general impression that he organized his system pyramidally, that everything is deduced by severe logical steps from the top principles of the sovereignty of God. This view is also supported by the general belief that Calvin's style is largely marked not only by lack of grace and ornamentation, but also by brevity.³³ All in all, to call Calvin a kind of logical machine would find relatively little contradiction.

Among present-day serious Calvin students there is a tendency to give all this a sharp critical look.³⁴ This essay proposes at this point a look at the logic of the *Institutes* in the light of its rhetorical form.

There is a logic in the *Institutes*. In fact, it is full of logic. But the logic is not syllogistic. It is rhetorical logic. Syllogistic logic uses induction and the syllogism; rhetorical logic uses example and the enthymeme.

It should be clear why Calvin does not use syllogistic logic. The reason is that it could not have expressed all that he had to say, and besides he could not have held his readers' attention. For induction and syllogism are of the essence of formal scientific discourse. Induction means that one starts with an insight or intuition or hunch, and proceeds to verify it by as exhaustive as possible a canvass of every particular instance of the insight, to determine whether the insight is true. This is hard labor, and therefore one does not subject a general reading public to it. The public can more easily follow an argument when one reasons from examples. This in effect is a partial induction, a kind of sampling. The more striking the examples, the more effective they are. Now it is evident that an argument based on an induction which is as complete as possible is likely to convince, while argument from example can only persuade.

Syllogistic logic uses the syllogism. A syllogism has three members: major premise, minor premise, and conclusion. In formal logical or scientific discourse each of these three must be used in each part of the total reasoning process. That is, nothing must be left to chance as to the reader's understanding of what the major and minor premises and the conclusion are. Also, the reader has the right to know that every step of the reasoning (of major and minor premises and conclusion) has been well proved.

But this is extremely burdensome, and the general reader is therefore not subjected to it. So instead of the syllogism the enthymeme is used. An enthymeme is a syllogism, but it has only two members.³⁵ One member is omitted. It may be any of the three: major premise, minor premise, or conclusion. It is assumed that the reader will know and regard as true the omitted member.

Let this be an example of a syllogism:

Major premise: All men are mortal.

Minor premise: Socrates is a man.

Conclusion: Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

Here are variations of enthymeme:

Major premise: All men are mortal.

Conclusion: Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

It is quite clear that the reader can for himself supply the minor premise (Socrates is a man). Or, one can say:

Minor premise: Socrates is a man.

Conclusion: Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

The reader can well supply the major premise. Or:

Major premise: All men are mortal.

Minor premise: Socrates was a man.

Not only can the general reader supply the missing members, but he might consider himself treated like a child were he to have each member stated. Besides, it makes the discourse stiff. And finally, the effectiveness of omission can be considerable: All men are mortal. Socrates was a man! This is more dramatic than the syllogism.

What of Calvin and argument by example and enthymeme? Let me confess not to have made more than a few soundings. His use of example is generally striking, but it is not even near to induction, so far as I have seen. Consequently I have not found a true syllogism in combination with induction. Examples of enthymeme and one syllogism may be found in Bk II, iii, 3 and 4:³⁶

Major premise: God wishes to take thought of the human race.
(Omitted minor premise: Men of heroic stature are of benefit to mankind.)

Conclusion: Therefore, God often outfits men destined to rule with heroic natures.

The omission of the minor premise seems as harmless as omitting, Socrates was a man. There are several terms, however, which are not examined. This may damage the conclusion, but not necessarily; for the reasoning as a whole can be valid in the sense that no step need be false.

Major premise: God's common grace gives virtues for which history praises great leaders.

(Omitted minor premise: These virtues do not belong to the natures of said great leaders.)

Conclusion: Therefore, common grace does not affect the natures of said great leaders.

Here the omitted minor premise is crucial. It is not examined here, nor is it examined as exhaustively as possible elsewhere.³⁷ The conclusion may still represent the truth, but not because it is based on good reasoning. Here is a syllogism:

Major premise: Ambition is what drives the non-elect who are praised for their virtue.

Minor premise: Ambition befools all their virtues.

Conclusion: Therefore, whatever appears worthy of praise in the non-elect must be accounted of no merit.

As a syllogism this is valid if the premises are true. But these are not examined. Terms like "ambition" and "befoul" need careful definition. The conclusion as such may be true, but not as a conclusion on the basis of the premises as they stand.

IV.

The last comments to be made on Calvin's rhetoric have to do with style in the sense of *elocutio*. It deals not with *what* but with *how* to

say a thing. Style must suit the purposes of the writer. Deliberative discourse generally has three purposes: to teach, move, and delight. The style of the *Institutes* is suited to each of these three, but in varying degrees.

Calvin's first purpose is to teach. The style suited to this is marked above all by clarity. As was said before, he spoke rather of brevity. Calvin can be brief. But generally he is expansive. So the claim to brevity is not convincing. In its place one can very well put vividness. His style is generally lively and even spirited. This also belongs to the subject of moving and delighting the readers. The total effect is such that one is not left to doubt what he means. Therefore, he is a successful teacher by reason of clarity.

Calvin also aims at moving. In general this means that he wants to reduce to silence or to change those whose faith he regards as wrong or inadequate, and to make more zealous his followers in the faith. A study of the *Institutes* from this point of view should be interesting. Calvin uses sarcasm, which is difficult to answer, to reduce an enemy to silence; and as illustration, think of his words quoted above, "The pope and his bull-bearers conduct a profitable market (in indulgences)." To strengthen the faith of believers in man's insignificance, think of the rhetorical question which has personification, mixed metaphor, and hyperbole all in one sentence: "Do the treasures of heavenly wisdom come all on the run to direct the worm five feet long?" This could also belong to the next point, that of pleasing the reader.

What should one say about this third aim of deliberative discourse, that of giving pleasure? Lefranc speaks of the French edition of the *Institutes* (1541), when he notes "the music in Calvin's words and phrases," saying that "he instinctively looks for full and agreeable resonance." He quotes a literary critic who says, "(Calvin) who never seeks to please, makes concessions to the ear." Lefranc continues, "Far more than is commonly believed, Calvin is a veritable artist . . . in the manner in which he understands construction and vocabulary, and in his way of using images and comparisons which again and again are picturesque and pleasing to the taste."³⁸

If this is true of Calvin's French in the *Institutes* of 1541, what of his artistic ability in the Latin of the 1559 edition (which is our source in this essay)? Being no literary critic, I shall only submit a translation of a few passages, with a bit of comment. My version makes a bow to reasonably good English, but for the rest is literal; for my purpose is to show Calvin's love for metaphor, personification, resounding words and phrases, alliteration, and such.³⁹ Italicized parts should be specially noted.

"Within us, and all around us, everything is fouled with the greatest

filth; what is a little less dirty *laughs* (arridet), as if it were the cleanest. . . ."⁴⁰ (This is personification.)

"But no matter how clearly the Lord shows both Himself and his immortal Kingdom in the *mirror* of his works; yet such is our numbness that we are always dull before such transparent attestations; and the result is that they (the attestations) *flow out* (i.e., flow out of the mirror; an interesting metaphor) to us profitlessly. Indeed, as touching the structure and very beautiful setting of the world, how many of us *bring back our eyes* to a memory of the Creator, after we have *lifted them* to the heavens or have *borne them about* through the various regions of the earth? . . . But when (by the evidence in nature) we are compelled to reflect about God . . . [and] . . . when by chance we have conceived a sense of some divinity, we forthwith *slide* (delabimur) to the mad dreams and the distorted fictions of our flesh. . . . We are unlike each other in that (from the mad dreams and distorted fictions) *each privately summons* (arcessit) to himself some peculiar error; but in this we are all alike, that all of us to a man abandon the one true God for unnatural trifles (prodigiosa nugamenta). In this sickness are *enfolded* (impllicantur) not only men of common and dull quality, but also men most clearly endowed with a singular sharpness. How extensively has the whole breed (natio) of philosophers published their obtuseness (stoliditatem) and want of discrimination (insulsitatem) on this subject. We may spare (parcamus) others who trifle in more pointless absurdities (qui multo absurdius ineptiunt); but [we cannot spare] Plato, of all the most religious and conspicuously not out of his mind (maxime sobrius), for he himself vanishes in his round globe (see the *Timaeus*). And what will happen to the rest, when the foremost men whose [place] it was to *hold the light before others* themselves *wander* in mind and *stumble* about (impingant, a transitive verb used intransitively; here is the figure of the labyrinth, a favorite with Calvin)."⁴¹

"Hence that measureless filthy *conflux* of errors which has *stuffed* the whole world and *buried* it (*refertus ac coopertus*). In fact, to each man his mind (*ingenium*) is *like a labyrinth*; so it is not astonishing that the several nations have been divided, each to follow *its own fictions*. And not only this, but it is very nearly so that every individual man has a god of his own. Now that thoughtlessness and waywardness are joined to ignorance and darkness, there is scarcely ever found one who does not *fabricate for himself* an apparition or phantasm in the place of God. Truly, just as waters boil forth from a *vast and impetuous bubbling spring* (ex vasta amplaque scaturigine), so the immense *crowd of gods* flow forth out of the mind of man. (The metaphor of the labyrinth suggests the metaphor of the vast and impetuous spring.) . . . Yet it is not necessary here to *weave* a catalogue of the superstitions in which the world was *entangled* (metaphor of a spider's web, suggested by the labyrinth, etc.; someone has called these metaphors of indirection). The untutored and unlearned commonfolk I pass over. But among the philosophers, who by reason of learning try to penetrate heaven, how shameful is their diversity! As each one was gifted with higher genius and, refined by art and science, each accordingly seemed to *lay bright paints* on his own opinions; but on closer inspection you will find them all to be *fading cosmetics* (metaphor of face-painting) . . . [The Epicureans] set in motion disputes (movere lites; *Digest*, IV. iii, 33), which have no conclusion; and much too ignorantly do they argue, or rather, *from the ignorance* of men they bring into [court] a *flimsy* to cover their impiety (nebulam inducunt ex hominum inscitia)."⁴²

"Therefore it is bootless that in the work that is the world there shine for us so many burning *torches* to illumine the glory of the builder. These so light up everything that nevertheless they cannot at all by themselves lead us into the right way. And *sparks* they certainly kindle, but these are choked before they might grow into a brighter flash."⁴³

V.

Finally, some conclusions.

In an earlier connection I quoted Professor Wolfson about the Renaissance philosophers who adopted new literary forms of writing, among them the Ciceronian rhetoric. I identified Calvin's discourse with the latter. Wolfson continues as follows: "But all these literary forms proved a disappointment. Instead of merely garbing the logical nakedness of the syllogism—that logical syllogism which must inevitably be implied in every sound argument—they sometimes served as a cloak to cover up any kind of logic and reasoning. Philosophy became metaphorical and effusive. What was gained in grace was lost in accuracy and precision."⁴⁴ What can one say to this?

To begin with, it is important to maintain that theological statement must bear the marks of a science. As such it must be led by intellectual curiosity. Hence there must be no real avoidance of subjects like God's being because it is better adored than rationally explored. As a science theology must aim at the maximum of precision. Therefore, there must be no real substitution of rhetorical logic for strict syllogistic logic, and no real emphasis must be derived from colorful language and figurative speech. This scientific nature of theology is here pressed, on the advice of the old saying: He who distinguishes well teaches well. Theology is not religion; it is a science.

However, actually and historically, the form of theological discourse has often been anything but strictly syllogistic. Much of it has been rhetorical. It is obvious that rhetoric has perils for theology, for its end is persuasion, and its means include a weakened logic—to name no other here. But the truth of theological statement need not be invalidated by a style calculated to move men. But the test of truth is only in part pragmatic; another test is logical, having to do with contradiction, coherence, and such. The latter is also indispensable as a basis for dialogue between rival theological groups. Thus the logical tests must be applied to, say, the assumptions of the *Institutes*; and no matter how true its assumptions may prove to be, they cannot be said to be so on the strength of its rhetoric alone.

It can be assumed that Calvin was no mere opportunist in choosing to write rhetorically. He wrote as a child of his humanistic age and training. Had he written in syllogistic style his book would not likely have become what it was—a work known everywhere. He shunned syllogistic also because it seemed profitless. The scholastics seemed

to him to yield little knowledge of things divine, and nothing for the public good; it harvested only disputation about trifles, and gave satisfaction only to those who had spent the best years of their lives in learning a technical vocabulary. All this seemed to him the more tragic because men generally were kept ignorant of something of surpassing importance which he had experienced and which he believed he could communicate to them. And communicate he did. The *Institutes* has a vehemence which makes its message still today one of the impressive options as to ways of Christian thought and conduct. Its force derives from a masterly use of, so to say, the organ of rhetoric—with surprising graceful airs though largely in a minor key, but more generally with wall-shaking bourdons and open diapasons.

Finally, the most significant reason for the rhetoric of the *Institutes* is that which is writ large in the form itself of rhetoric. This is that to Calvin theology should be the possession of the common man. Therefore the *Institutes* is addressed to the general reading public. If it is not the first work of its kind in the Renaissance, it is the most distinguished. It presents a profound subject matter in a style any intelligent man can comprehend. Other would follow, like Francis Bacon, Descartes, Hobbes, Bossuet, Pascal. Some of these perhaps had scarcely read Calvin well, and perhaps cared little. But for the present purpose this does not matter. What matters is that in modern times many significant writers of philosophical and theological literature in greater or lesser degree have held the reading public in mind.⁴⁵ It is perhaps a mark of the modern era for men not to entrust to a specially trained class the keeping and interpretation of either the wisdom of men or the oracles of God.⁴⁶

1. The word *traits* is used so as to cover the genres of rhetorical discourse, the nature of proof, and the style. *Style*, used strictly, is called *elocutio*; it is also used loosely, to cover genres and proof. It is largely used more or less loosely in this essay; when used strictly it will be made clear that *elocutio* is meant.
2. That Calvin might not say this is of no moment here.
3. Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Harvard University Press, 1947. I defer to Professor Wolfson in much, because of his long and comprehensive interest in the style of philosophical discourse.
4. See H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of Spinoza*, Harvard University Press, 1934, Vol I, p. 39. Attentive reading of Chapters I "Behind the Geometric Method" and II "The Geometric Method" is rewarding for our subject.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 54.
6. *Ibid.*, 40-43; see also 46-53. Benson Mates, *Stoic Logic*, University of California Press, 1953, *passim*.
7. Cicero, *De Oratore*, III, 14, 54-22, 85; III, 35, 141-143.
8. The reaction was not universal, not even among humanists. This is clear from Pico's famous letter to Barbaro. See E. Garin, "Giovanni Pico della Mirandola a Ermolao Barbaro," *Prosa-tori latini del quattrocento*, Milano, Napoli, pp. 805-823, 844-863; Q. Breen's translations of the same things and also of Melanchthon's Reply to Pico in Behalf of Barbaro, in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, XIII (1952), pp. 384-426; and "The Subordination of Philosophy to Rhetoric in Melanchthon," *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte*, Jahrgang 43 (1952) Heft 1, pp. 13-28. See also Paul Oskar Kristeller, *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*, Harvard University Press, 1955, pp. 11-13; and E. Harris Harbison, *The Christian Scholar in the Age*

of the Renaissance, New York, 1956, pp. 34-37, and 49-54.

9. H. A. Wolfson, *Spinoza*, I, 56-57.

10. Abel Lefranc, *Grands écrivains français de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1914, pp. 350-357, "Le style de Calvin."

11. Bishop Bossuet gave currency to the characterization of Calvin's style as "triste;" see his "Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes," "Oeuvres complètes de Bossuet . . . par F. Lachet, Paris, 1863, p. 389, par. lxxxi.

12. Q. Breen, Mario Nizolio: "De veris principiis et vera ratione philosophandi contra pseudo-philosophos," libri IV, 2 vols. Roma (Fratelli Bocca Editori), 1956. Introduction in English, pp. xv-xxiv. See particularly pp. lxiii-lxx; "Marius Nizolius: Ciceronian Lexicographer and Philosopher," *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte*, xlvi (1955), 69-87.

13. While I know of no documented influence of the *Institutes* on Peter Ramus the *Institutes* does in ways practice what Ramus expounds.

14. See Note 8 above.

15. *Inst.* I, v. 9; *CR* II, 47.

16. *CR* II, 41-47.

17. Paragraphs 1-8 established by epideictic the premises laid down in par. 9 just quoted.

18. Aristotle (*Rhet.* I, iii, 3) says that the persons sitting in judgment on epideictic are the mere spectators of the speaker's ability; on forensic they are the judge in the court; on deliberative they are the members of a general assembly, and as such also judges of the discourse.

19. See E. Harris Harbison, *op. cit.*, pp. 152, esp. 158-164.

20. See note 16 above.

21. See Section III below.

22. *CR* II, 455-470.

23. *Inst.*, III, iv, 7; *CR* II, 461-2. The chapter also deals with confession and satisfaction.

24. This is lofty humanistic scorn, and hardly pertinent to the argument. The intention of Innocent's law is not in doubt.

25. *CR* II, 9-30.

26. It may be suggested that much in the *Institutes* can be called both epideictic and forensic. Even "publishing of a confession (action) in the presence (in the court) of King Francis (as judge)" is not a real suit at law but a show-piece (as rhetoricians say, meaning no disrespect). The *Antidosis* of Isocrates was such a show-piece; very likely also the defense of latinizing his name, by Majoragius (a contemporary of Calvin). See A. Taylor and F. J. Mosher: *Bibliographical History of Anonymity and Pseudonymity*. Chicago, 1951, pp. 18-19.

27. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* I, ii, 3; in II, i-xviii there is very much suggestion. See also Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* XII, i.

28. *Op. cit.* II iv, 25-30. No one believed the king had even read Calvin's Letter, much less the *Institutes*. The Letter makes much of condemnation of the doctrine without a hearing, and the reprinting of it in front of each new edition kept reminding people of that. This, too, could add to the esteem for Calvin as a man of worth.

29. *CR* II, 462, "conductitii papae rabulae."

30. *CR* II, 491, "a papa et suis bulligeris . . . quaestuosa nundinationes . . . exerceri."

31. It may be suggestive to see an application of ethical proof in Calvin's argument for the truth of Scripture from the testimony of the Holy Spirit. See *Inst.* I, vii, 4; *CR* II, 58.

32. *Life*, December 26, 1955, pp. 41-42.

33. Calvin idealized brevity: "Brevitati studio (*Inst.* II, iii, 2; *CR* II, 210); "Pudet me in re tam clara tantum verborum consumere" (*Inst.* III, xxv, 8; *CR* II, 738); See also "Argument du Present Livre," *CR* III, xxv. See W. S. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England 1500-1700*, Princeton University Press, 1956, p. 293. The brief, undecorated style is by Zeno called one suited to dialectic or logic, and is like the closed fist. Opposite to the dialectical style is that which is copious and ornamented, suited to rhetoric; it is like the open hand.

34. See F. Wendel, *Calvin: Sources et évolution de sa pensée religieuse*, Paris, 1950, pp. 273-4, who disputes the notion that Calvin has a closed logical system. See also Harbison, *op. cit.*, pp. 156-7. Joseph Bohaté, *Budé und Calvin: Studien sur Gedankenwelt des französischen Frühhumanismus*, Graz, 1950, says that Calvin's organization of the subject matter belongs to a true rhetoric; also, that his concept of the harmony of Scripture derives from Budé's influence.

35. There is much literature on the enthymeme, and there has been diversity of view about its precise meaning. I follow the prevailing view that it is a syllogism with only two members.

36. *CR* II, 211-213.

37. For some assumptions that needed examination, see Roy W. Battenhouse, "The Doctrine of Man in Calvin and in Renaissance Platonism," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, IX (1948), esp. pp. 469-470.

38. Abel Lefranc, *op. cit.*, 356-7.

39. My version is not intended as a guide to those who are now translating the *Institutes* for the Library of Christian Classics. For the true savor of an au-

thor's style there is no substitute for the original language. The translation by Thomas Norton (1574) catches Calvin's quality much better than that of either Allen or Beveridge.

40. *Inst.* I, i, 2; *C.R.* II, 32.
41. *Inst.* I, v, ii; *CR* II, 49.
42. *Inst.* I, v, 12; *C.R.*, 50.
43. *Inst.* I, V, 14; *C.R.*, 51.
44. H. A. Wolfson, *Spinoza*, I, 57.
45. See Leibniz, "De stilo philosophico Nizolii," J. E. Erdmann (ed.), *G. C. Leibnitii Opera Philosophica*, pars prior, Berolini, 1840, p. 62.
46. This tends to sublimate the function of syllogistic, the hard work of specially trained experts in logic. Yet its turn must come, for the owl of Minerva wakes up after the shade of night has fallen.

NATIONALISM AND MISSIONS*

R. PIERCE BEAVER, *University of Chicago*

Nationalism in the Orient came into being as a reaction to Western and Japanese political, military, economic, and cultural imperialism. It still has this character in countries remaining under colonial rule. This nationalism is a phenomenon of the twentieth century, although arising somewhat earlier in certain countries. Anti-western movements before this time were manifestations of cultural resistance to European penetration rather than truly nationalistic expressions. The Boxer Uprising of 1900 in China is the last major example of such a cultural reaction. Thereafter love and pride of ancient culture became increasingly only one ingredient in patriotic loyalty and devotion. Intensified during World War I, this earlier type of nationalism reached its climax in Asia in the period of World War II, and came to fruition in the independence of eight nations in East and Southern Asia. Since then this earlier type of nationalism has been replaced by a religious statism, to which many Western nations had already succumbed and which had led Japan to disaster. The entire Orient is far too vast an area for treatment in a brief paper, and this survey is limited to a mere outline of the relation of nationalism to the Christian mission as illustrated by events in some countries of East Asia, where along with India the issues were most sharply raised.

The missionaries were the most widely distributed agents of Western cultural penetration throughout Asia and the only Westerners ever seen by the majority of rural villagers and townsmen. Consequently local demonstrations were likely to be directed against them. Excepting in capitals and great port cities, where there was more knowledge of the outside world and more political discernment, the missionary appeared to the people far more as a representative of European culture in general than of his own particular nation. Where there was vigorous imperialistic aggression, however, all missionaries might be popularly identified with the imperial power regardless of their specific nationality. Thus not only in Indo-China but throughout East Asia during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Roman Catholic missionaries were quite generally regarded as Frenchmen because the French missionaries were so long the most numerous and especially because France claimed protection over all Roman Catholic missionary agents and work and used that protection as a pretext for imperialistic aggression. Similarly in India, Protestants

*A paper read at the joint session of the American Catholic Historical Association and the American Historical Association at Washington, D. C., on December 29, 1955.

regardless of nationality were identified with British rule. Since missionary activity in East Asia was made possible by treaties imposed by force and because the missionary repeatedly turned to his nation for protection for him and his native converts, it was only natural that many should think of the man as the agent of his country.

However, it was only in a few colonial areas that the missionary's own nationalism was much of a factor in his own motivation. Dutch Protestant missions have been confined entirely to Indonesia, with very slight attention also to Surinam, and consequently have been very closely identified with Dutch imperialism. It is only within very recent years that the Roman Catholic Church in Indo-China has been able to cleanse itself of the stigma of French imperialism and become accepted as a national institution. American nationalism was a very potent factor in the replacement of Spanish Roman Catholic clergy by Americans in the Philippines and in the introduction of Protestantism into those islands. Devotion to the aims of the Empire certainly played some part in British missionary work in British colonies, but such national identification has been made less obvious by the presence in the same colonies of missionary agents of many other nationalities and by the fact that British missionaries have gone widely over the world into areas not ruled by Great Britain or the nations of the Commonwealth. Part of a missionary's nationalistic interest in the colonies ruled by his country was a genuine Christian concern for the subject peoples, a desire that Christian principles should guide colonial policy, and that the native peoples should be protected from exploitation by the government and commercial and industrial interests. This purpose was just as strong in the early twentieth century as it had been when the missionaries had been protectors of the Indians in the Spanish Conquest of America and protagonists of the people against European exploitation in the Pacific Islands in the nineteenth century. Dr. A. Schreiber, when speaking on German missions at the Ecumenical Missionary Conference of 1900, was voicing the conviction of all missionaries involved in the imperialism of their own countries when he stated: "Especially in our own colonies we consider it to be our duty to watch over the interests of the natives . . . We also consider it to be our duty to protect all the natives, without exception, against pernicious influences from Europeans, such as the trade in opium and ardent spirits, and especially immorality."¹

Although the missionaries might at times flaunt their nationalism in the faces of Oriental peoples by raising foreign flags over their buildings and by calling in gunboats to protect them, the average missionary, nevertheless, did not think of himself primarily as a national citizen but as the servant of the Lord and Savior of all the

world, and even if he belonged to the smallest denomination, he regarded himself as the representative of the universal Church. The supervision of the Sacred Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, the international basis of support provided by the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, the world-wide hierarchy, the liturgical uniformity of the Roman Rite, the identical seminary system everywhere and the discipline of the rules of the various international orders all tend to suppress the national identification of the Roman Catholic missionary and to emphasize his supranational character. Similarly the Protestant missionary enterprise has been a common cause, and despite the fact that the mission has been undertaken by hundreds of denominational boards and societies in many different countries, there has been manifested in it a unity far beyond that known by the clergy and laity in general. Comity and co-operation gradually gave concrete expression to this unity.

It is to be observed that if the missionary demonstrated much nationalistic fervor it was more likely to be on behalf of his adopted nation and the people among whom he served than on behalf of his own national allegiance. Much has been said about the failure of the missionary to identify himself with the indigenous culture, yet almost always he has identified himself emotionally with the welfare of the country and its people even though he might not wear their clothes and eat their food. He might when at home on furlough paint a dark picture of conditions in order to gain support in prayers and money, but he has been even more likely in lectures, conversations, and writing to mediate to his fellow countrymen his understanding of the character of a people and his knowledge of the best in their culture. He has also usually become a vigorous advocate and apologist for his adopted country, laboring strenuously to make its viewpoint known, to defend its position and to lobby on its behalf with his own government. Many a missionary has been far less dispassionate and objective in analyzing the policies of his adopted country than those of his own home land. This could easily be demonstrated in the case of missionaries to Japan, for example, from the time of Verbeck, to that of Bishop Harris, whom the Koreans considered to be a Japanese agent, down to the apologists for the nation during the last Japanese invasion of China. The volume entitled *The Missionary Outlook in Light of the War*, published in 1920, rebuked this attitude on the part of missionaries, admonishing them:

Provincialism is always a bar to progress, whether exercised in a village, or at a capital, or in a mission area. It is religiously no less than politically belittling. It has been excusable and perhaps commendable when discovered to be the incidental accompaniment of an age of pioneering, which has demanded great and practically exclusive devotedness to a

district and its interests or to a single human group. It will not continue to be commendable in the new age which we are facing. It is pleasing to the traveler in mission areas to note the real enthusiasm of the true missionary for his adopted people and their interests, political as well as social. He is quite as likely as a national to be partisan. He resents intensely the unfairness with which greater powers may deal with his lifelong friends and their interests. His heart beats high over their national advancement or becomes chilled over their misfortunes. He not infrequently shares their prejudices and sympathizes with their attitudes towards other peoples, through the very completeness of his identification with them. Every traveler in Japan and China has had occasion to notice this natural, and from some aspects rather noble, characteristic. Yet it must yield to the demands of Christian internationalism, which seeks to promote friendliness among all nations. China, Japan, and Korea must eventually become in some sense a Far Eastern unit. Only the missionary who can think soberly in terms of the Far East as a whole, whether his definite task is Manchuria, Korea, China, Japan, or the Philippines, will be a wise and helpful leader in the next quarter century.²

The steadily increasing importance of nationalism as one of the chief dimensions of the missionary situation in Asia may be traced in the studies made for, and the reports of, the series of Protestant World Missionary Conferences, supplemented by general surveys. When the Ecumenical Missionary Conference met in New York in 1900 the addresses on Anti-Christian Forces were given under the three headings: The Drink Traffic, Degraded Womanhood, and the Ancient Ethical Systems. Nationalism was not in the picture. There were only two passing references to the fact that the Japanese Diet had recently declared that Shinto was not a religion but a means "for the cultivation of the national spirit" and to the Arya Somaj's charge that Indian Christians were traitors to their country as well as to Hinduism.³ However, when a decade had passed and the first official World Missionary Conference was held at Edinburgh in 1910, much was heard about "the urgency in view of the growing spirit of nationalism," and evidence was brought from many lands. A widespread movement was noted among the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Oceania towards independence of European and American control growing steadily in intensity since the Russo-Japanese War. Japan had furnished the most powerful example of free and triumphant nationalism, but it was also a mighty force in China, Korea, Turkey, India, Ceylon, Persia, Siam, Java, the Philippines, Egypt, and the natives of South Africa. A new self-consciousness was to be found in these peoples, proud of their past, believing themselves possessed of the resources and ability to contribute to the life of the world, wanting to preserve their individuality and independence, and determined to be true to their national and racial characteristics.⁴ It was being proclaimed in Japan that the universal Christian mission was antagonistic to the divine world-wide mission of that na-

tion, while in China officials were regarding the mission as a form of Western political action. It was feared that governments would soon be imposing restrictive regulations on mission work. Therefore, the Conference advised the missionaries:

This national and racial spirit cannot and should not be crushed or checked. It is a matter of profound concern to the Christian Church. It will have power to hinder or to facilitate the spread of Christ's Kingdom. Christ never by teaching or example resisted or withheld the spirit of true nationalism. Wherever His principles, including those pertaining to the supreme claims of His Kingdom on earth, have had largest right of way, they have served to strengthen national spirit not to weaken it. And yet there is grave and imminent danger that the teaching and attitude of the Church may be misunderstood among the non-Christian nations, and that the missionary propaganda may be greatly hindered.⁶

Let the mission, then, see the development and spread of patriotism as an inspiring summons to carry the gospel of Christ to all peoples. "Pure Christianity should be brought to bear at once in order to help to educate, purify, unify, guide, and strengthen the national spirit."⁷ The movement might well be made to stimulate support of the indigenous ministry.⁷ Under its impact every effort ought to be made to correct the tendency of Christian education to denationalize converts.⁸

Nationalist movements gained strength during the First World War and the idealism proclaimed by the Allies, especially the self-determination of peoples, called forth enthusiasm and hope among subject peoples like the Koreans and politically dominated ones like the Chinese. The League of Nations ushered in fifteen years of internationalism in which the nations were to become a family of brethren. Despite extreme nationalist pressure which drove most missionaries out of China, increasing bitterness in Korea, the shrine question in Japan, and difficulties in India, the Protestant missionaries marched in the forefront of the internationalist idealists. They even claimed much of the credit for the emerging new world order, saying that missions was the creator of both nationalism and internationalism. Nationalism was but the prerequisite to internationalism.

A survey made by American agencies immediately after the war voiced the prevailing sentiment.⁹ It was asserted that missionaries through literature, education, and other activities not only acquainted Eastern peoples with the national history and ideals of the Western nations but also imparted something of their own patriotic and nationalistic aspirations. This stimulated the awakening of new national ambitions in non-Christian peoples, "unconsciously arousing them to the formulation and prosecution of new national programs in which the simulation of foreign elements has been combined with a revitalization of indigenous institutions and ideals." The gospel,

proclaiming new life for the individual, asserted the worth of all men in the sight of God, kindled a new faith in the possibilities of men, fostered a sense of social responsibility, and consequently contributed to the development of a worthy national life. "It has been no part of the missionary emphasis to disintegrate the national consciousness. Rather it has tended to promote and to guide national ambitions to high ends. The missionary has held before the nations . . . the ideal of a Christian national life, insisting that it must be built on righteousness, and representing Christianity as the power without which the highest nationhood cannot be realized." Mutual cooperation of worthy national units produces internationalism. Foreign missions had, it was claimed, been quietly laying the foundations for this new internationalism with a "record of influences that have been breaking down racial barriers, interpreting the East and West to each other, revealing the idealistic side of Western life, incarnating the spirit of service and good will; developing in non-Christian lands a leadership sympathetic to democracy, promoting friendly contacts between widely separated peoples, and in other ways hastening the coming of a higher type of international relations."

The same mode of thought, but now somewhat more sober, was still in fashion when the International Missionary Council held an enlarged meeting at Jerusalem in 1928. Secularism and scientism were seen as the great antagonists, resulting in a new relativism. The birthpangs of nationalism were said to be accompanied by a great yearning for social justice, human brotherhood, and international peace.¹⁰ Noble elements in nationalism were found to be "the loyalty of self-devotion, the idealism which love of country can inspire"; but even these can lead to strife, bitterness, and narrowness if not dedicated to Christ. "When patriotism and science are not consecrated they are often debased into self-assertion, exploitation, and the service of greed." The great peril of the times is that man's power over the resources of nature has outgrown spiritual and moral control. Christians are obliged to labor unceasingly for a new world order in which justice shall be secured for all peoples and every occasion of war or threat of war removed.¹¹ One persistent threat of armed intervention in the past had been the protection of missionaries by their nations. Consequently such protection was now renounced as wrong and as a hindrance to the gospel.¹² Nationalism was pinching the mission hardest in the field of education. The place of religion in education was affirmed, the need of private schools alongside the state system upheld, and religious liberty demanded.¹³

Two important surveys appeared in 1932. One was a ten-year summary of the missionary situation by the editors of the *International Review of Missions*, and the other was the Report of the Laymen's

Inquiry, *Re-Thinking Missions*. A new type of nationalism in the West, much like that of Japan in the East, now had to be recognized. The "alternative religions" of Communism and nationalism were declared to be the most relentless foes of the Christian faith, and the inevitability of a clash was foreseen, since they demanded that allegiance and worship which can be given only to God.¹⁴ Yet the Laymen's Inquiry still saw Eastern nationalism as being largely a deliberate reaction against Western domination and control, as an exaggeration of national temper which would not pass away until the desired economic, political, and cultural self-sufficiency had been achieved.¹⁵ The Laymen held Eastern nationalism now to be inclusive and not opposed to the spread of a world culture, but, because of supersensitivity towards Western control, Christianity's Western connection brought suspicion rather than prestige, and the faith could only hope to get a fair hearing if it were presented in its universal capacity.

The World Missionary Conference of 1938 had to be shifted from Hangchow to Madras because of the Japanese invasion of China, and it met on the eve of war in Europe. A new paganism was seen to have arisen, making the genius of a nation the object of worship, demanding religious devotion of its adherents. The divine gift of nationality had been corrupted by sin and the nation had usurped a divine status. The Church in this situation must steadfastly proclaim: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."¹⁶ Therefore, in its "Message to the Peoples" the Conference affirmed that national gods are too small to save and that Christ alone can lift a nation to its highest destiny. Just as the delegates themselves had felt the national tensions which they had brought with them dissolve in the fellowship of Christian brethren knit together by the Holy Spirit, so the whole world might share this experience.¹⁷ The deep sense of unity achieved at the Conference remained unbroken during the war that followed, and was expressed in the support of Orphaned Missions under the auspices of the International Missionary Council.¹⁸

Since the end of World War II the International Missionary Council has held an enlarged meeting at Whitby, Ontario, in 1947 and a full scale World Missionary Conference at Willingen, Germany, in 1952. An East Asia Christian Conference met at Bangkok in December, 1949, under the joint auspices of the I. M. C. and the World Council of Churches. The Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches called forth the publication of a survey volume entitled *Christianity and the Asian Revolution*, based on reports from the National Christian Councils in the East. The literature assembled in connection with these events clearly sets forth the concern of the mission with present day nationalism.¹⁹

Current nationalism is religious statism set in the context of a revolt of Asian and African peoples against Western, white colonialism, economic dominance, and pretensions to superiority; against hunger, landlessness, disease, and poverty; against lack of human dignity, rights, and power. Communism seeks cleverly to capture this revolution and in its strategy tries to identify itself with the national interest, until it obtains full control as in China, north Korea, and Viet Minh. While all East and South Asia are caught up in this revolution and its general characteristics are much the same everywhere, it comes to a focus in each country in the form of nationalism. It is the state which is the supreme authority and the supreme good. While impotent under foreign control, it becomes when independent the savior which will achieve all the goals of the revolution by being a welfare state. Not only is the national state the object of supreme allegiance and devotion, but it gathers to itself all the hallowed associations and loyalties of the folk religion, which is now identified with the state. There is a genuine revival of ethnic religion but the nation attempts to direct that new life to its own ends. "Nationalism," say the Asian churchmen, "imparts a new interpretation to religion. Instead of being an isolated and insulated factor in people's lives, largely other-worldly and spiritual, religion is made part of the this-worldly and secular force of Nationalism."²⁰ Thus Islam is an integral part of nationalism in Pakistan, Malaya and Indonesia; Buddhism in Ceylon and Burma; Hinduism in India; and some claim that position for Roman Catholic Christianity in the Philippines. Such nationalism is making the role of the foreign missionary increasingly difficult, and in India, Burma, and Indonesia entry and residence visas are granted to only a minority of applicants. It is feared that India's policy of granting entrance only to missionaries with specialized training or skill helpful to the nation and taking a position for which no Indian is available will be followed by others. Missionaries are denied entrance to, or are ejected from, areas said to be strategic, as the Naga Hills of Assam. Evangelism in many places is possible only by national agents, and "proselytism," as it is called, is denounced, despite the clauses on freedom of religion in most constitutions. The state increasingly provides, or claims to provide, education, health, and other welfare services, in which the missions pioneered and which are still large-scale activities of the churches, with the expectation that if the trend continues it will result, as in China, in the elimination of all such services on the part of the Church. Thus in many places the old methods of missionary propagation and nurture are no longer possible or are less and less effective.

The concern about nationalism shown in the central study and planning conferences was based, naturally, on the concrete facing

of this issue in the countries of East Asia and India especially. Time will permit only the brief delineation of the course of events in Japan, where the introduction of Christianity coincided with the rise of aggressive nationalism; in Korea, where Christianity became the vehicle for the preservation of national hopes in reaction against Japanese domination; and in China, where what would otherwise have been effective missionary strategy chanced to play into the hands of inexperienced leaders of a new student patriotic movement. Time further permits only the narration of this story to the end of World War II in Japan and Korea. The illustration from China is limited to the rise of a truly nationalistic anti-Christian movement.

Japan's pride of race and culture was transformed almost overnight into a genuine religious statism in reaction to the intrusion of the West. The symbol of the Emperor, the support of Shinto tradition, and a sense of world mission were the marks of a religious nationalism which would not appear in the West for more than another half century. Adopting certain aspects of Western culture in order quickly to become a great power, the government set up a school system, introduced Western medicine, imported teachers, and sent students abroad, thus depriving missions of the privilege of pioneering in these matters as in the other Eastern countries and of employing these services as unique forms of evangelism. During the decade of the 1880's converts were numerous and it appeared as if Christianity might be generally adopted, but the central core of Japanese culture remained under a thin veneer of westernism, and the fundamental conflict between the claims of Christ and Japanese messianic nationalism were recognized by many.²¹ After the nationalistic reaction against the new faith in the decade of the 1890's, growth in membership was very slow.²² To this day Christianity has scarcely penetrated the rural population and has remained an urban movement in contrast to other Asian countries. The Roman Catholic Church had no more than overcome the prejudices resulting from the era of suppression when the rising tide of nationalism slowed down its progress.²³ The Russian Orthodox Mission weathered the storm of the Russo-Japanese War because of the wise guidance of Archbishop Nicolai and a pro-nationalistic attitude, but its growth was always hindered by the national phobia against Russia.²⁴ The Orthodox Church, more than any other, has suffered because of its identification with a foreign power, even after Russia became Communist and militantly anti-Christian, and despite the fact that Nicolai had earnestly tried to adapt it to its Japanese setting. Disappointment over the Treaty of Portsmouth and anti-American feeling arising from that appear to have sharpened a more general anti-Christian sentiment into a specific suspicion of the Protestant Churches.

Many of the early converts, and consequently many of the native clergy, were from the Samurai class. They had both ability and national devotion. They at once took over control of the ecclesiastical organization of most of the Protestant Churches which were not episcopal in polity, and the missionary was left in control only of the institutions, which continued to be supported largely by mission funds. Professor Knox's statement at the Edinburgh Conference of 1910 to the effect that a missionary in Japan could be influential only if he left the initiative to the Japanese and cooperated with them was in sharp contrast to other areas.²⁵ Strangely, however, the Japanese clergy and lay leaders were content with self-government, and made no serious effort to recast doctrine, polity, and cultus in indigenous forms. The Protestant culture of Japan on the whole remained a rather weak copy of American church life.

Since the clergy and laity were ardently nationalistic and the missionaries were in the main also warmly pro-Japanese, a sharp clash between the government and the Church and mission was long avoided. The fact that in World War I Japan was an ally of the United States, Britain, and France, from which most missionaries came, and in the years after that war essayed to play a role in the international settlement, helped to postpone the conflict. Mission schools played a role subsidiary to the national system and were strictly controlled by regulations. The decade of the 1920's was the time of transition, and after the Manchurian Incident of 1931 militaristic totalitarianism was firmly in the saddle, hostility towards former allies was manifested, the national citizenship of the majority of missionaries became a handicap, and increasing pressure was exerted on all Christian agencies and institutions. After the invasion of China in 1937 many Protestant missionaries were forced to give up their pro-Japanese position and some found it necessary to leave the country. The Roman Catholic Church brought in new orders with missionaries of German and Italian nationality, countries with which the nation was to be allied in the next war.²⁶ The shrine issue brought conflict into the open. The Roman Catholic hierarchy in 1932 accepted the assurance of the Ministry of Education that the rites were patriotic and not religious, and in 1936 the Propaganda confirmed this decision.²⁷ Protestants were divided, but the nationals on the whole accepted the government's view while missionaries were more likely to regard the rites as religious.²⁸ The usefulness of the foreign missionary rapidly diminished, and by the year 1941 all administrative posts in all three major branches of the Church had been handed over to nationals.²⁹ By the summer of that year the Protestant missionary force had been reduced from about one thousand to approximately one hundred, and within a few months most of them were interned.³⁰

The Diet in 1939 passed a Religious Organizations Law. It granted recognition to Christianity along with Shinto and Buddhism, and provided for the combination of the responsible officers of all three in an All Japan Religious League for the promotion of such matters as the government might desire. The Roman Catholic Church complied immediately with the law; and thirty-four Protestant denominations hastened to announce their intention of uniting. The united Church of Christ in Japan (Kyodan) was officially organized on June 24, 1941, under pressure, but yet in line with the union efforts of many years.³¹ Elements which refused adherence were dissolved and driven underground. After the war many denominations left the Kyodan, but it still retains sixty-three percent of the total Protestant church membership.

After 1941 all Christians were carefully watched by the police, some ministers were imprisoned, while others were conscripted for military service or for liaison work with Christians in occupied areas. The most severe treatment was apparently accorded to the Orthodox Christians, and that Church was reduced to one-third its size by the end of the war.³² Still the Christians remained loyal. Some few years after the war they described their plight in these terms:

From the time of the so-called "Manchurian Incident" through the years developing into the Sino-Japanese conflict and then to World War II, the Japanese militaristic totalitarian policy developed from strength to strength. Severe restrictions and oppressions were increasingly placed on the churches. Freedom of belief, not to speak of freedom of speech, became impossible. The police even attended the worship services to hear what the ministers were preaching. There seemed only two alternatives for the churches, either to clash with the militaristic regime at the expense of the complete dissolution of the churches and even martyrdom, or to suffer together with their fellow countrymen in perseverance and sacrifice. The sense of national solidarity led our people to choose the latter position, as was true of the Christians in other lands.³³

Conservative Chinese resented the presence of the missionary during the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. Western governments had wrested treaties from an impotent Court giving him the right of entry, residence, itineration, acquisition of property, toleration for his religion, protection for his converts, and extraterritoriality for himself, removing him from the control of magistrates and bringing foreign gunboats and troops to his aid. The people did not know that all of this was merely incidental to much larger aims of the foreign nations, for the missionary was the only foreigner most of them saw. His teaching and other activities seemed to those who knew them chiefly by rumor to be undermining the very foundations of culture. Resentment manifested itself in opposition,

and when such opposition resulted in destruction of lives and property, heavy indemnities were often exacted. This stored up more resentment. This opposition, however, was until after the Boxer Uprising the fruit of pride in family and tradition and not of loyalty to the state or throne. Nationalism began to grow among a small number of liberal intellectuals after the Sino-Japanese War. It motivated the reform movements of the next fifteen years and issued in the establishment of the Republic in 1911. Japanese aggression, more sharply felt than earlier Western domination, stimulated this nationalism. The students took it up in the mid-twenties, and from that time forward it began to penetrate all classes of the population.

The extent to which Christianity contributed positively to the new nationalism through reform movements and individuals like Sun-Yat-sen is difficult to determine. The missionaries as early as 1910 recognized nationalism as a challenge to train up a responsible ministry, to place more authority in the hands of nationals, and to leaven the life of the land with Christian principles through an effective system of education.³⁴ The Protestants launched a "China for Christ Movement" in 1919. There was little anti-Christian agitation in the second decade of the century and troubles were due to provincial war lords and political disunity, rather than to nationalism. Christianity did not contribute negatively to rising nationalism by giving it a whipping boy until 1922, when students were responsible for creating an anti-Christian movement.³⁵ It was the Protestants rather than the Roman Catholics who bore the brunt of this agitation.

Students led the popular reaction against Japanese aggression in 1919, and held the center of the stage for the next few years. Infected by materialistic scepticism, scientism, and Communist atheism, which had come from the West to reinforce the traditional agnosticism of Chinese scholars, students discovered a Christian "plot" to seize control of the country. The evidence was the publication of two books in 1922 simultaneously with the creation of the National Christian Council. One was the huge volume, *The Christian Occupation of China*, with detailed accounts, tables, charts, and maps of churches, institutions, members, stations, population studies.³⁶ Territories actually occupied or assigned by comity agreements to particular missions were set forth in minutest detail, and all unoccupied or unassigned territory was also indicated. The object was to facilitate the evangelism of the whole country, but to the students it looked like the plan for a thorough and clever imperialistic penetration of the nation. The second book was the Burton Commission Report, *Christian Education in China*.³⁷ Educators and students now discovered from this survey the enormous extent of Christian education in the country, that these schools appeared to constitute

a rival system of education to that of the government, and, they charged, that they were denationalizing the students.³⁸

The meeting of the World Student Christian Federation in Peking also in 1922 stimulated some Shanghai students to form an Anti-Christian Federation, and then students in the universities and schools of Peking created an Anti-Religious Federation, both intended to fight Christianity as a superstition and as an expression of imperialism. The student-led movement was renewed in 1924, and at the same time the National Association for the Advancement of Education entered the fray, requesting the government to require the registration of Christian schools and to make the exclusion of religious instruction a requirement for such registration.

The China Christian Education Association then applied to the Peking government for terms of registration. However, Sun Yat-sen died on March 15, 1925, and the publication of his "Will" and his book, *San Min Chu I*, stirred up tremendous enthusiasm for uniting the country. The Kuomintang Party dedicated itself to the task. Just then occurred the Shanghai Incident of May thirtieth, when police of the International Settlement fired upon and killed student demonstrators. Agitation against foreign aggression and unequal treaties swept the country and reached fever heat. The Kuomintang army began its northward march in the summer of 1926. The excesses of the Communist wing, especially against foreigners, interrupted progress for a time, but after the expulsion of this element unification of the whole country was achieved by the end of 1928. The Peking government had in the interval issued regulations for the control of Christian schools, but the French Government as protector of Catholic missions had intervened, and the regulations were suspended as incompatible with the treaties. The Kuomintang government then issued far more severe regulations, and these were made effective. It was required that all schools be headed by a Chinese principal and directed by a board the majority of which must be Chinese. The curriculum had to conform to that of the state system, and no religious instruction might be given. Close supervision would be imposed, and registration must be accomplished by a specific date, in certain areas at least.³⁹

Meanwhile, the Communist wing of the Kuomintang up to the time of its expulsion had led a determined attack on the Church, Christians, and the missionaries.⁴⁰ Much property was destroyed. A missionary was killed at Nanking and homes were looted. Mission boards withdrew most of their missionaries from the interior and many from the country, although Roman Catholic missionaries generally remained at their posts. The Protestant missionary enterprise reached a very low ebb. Far from discouraged, however, the

missionaries claimed some of the credit for having awakened the national consciousness and commended the patriotism of the students.⁴¹ Despite the destruction and suffering inflicted on them during the process of unification the Christian community emerged from these events thoroughly nationalistic in outlook. The early years of Kuomintang control continued to show suspicion of the mission and Christianity. However, many of the high officers of the party and government were Christians, and others took a leading role in the Rural Reform, Mass Education, and New Life Movements. Exerting an influence all out of proportion to their numbers, Christians strove through all forms of Church action and individual devotion to contribute to the remarkable progress in national reconstruction down to the beginning of war in 1937. The majority of missionaries worked for the revision of the unequal treaties and renounced special privileges. By the end of the war with Japan Christianity had been quite generally accepted as indigenous and church membership had grown rapidly as evidence of that.⁴²

Korea presents the outstanding instance of the identification of nationalism with Christianity in the Far East. Within a few short years many citizens of a nation which had ruthlessly persecuted Christianity and made martyrs of scores of Roman Catholics and their missionaries, found in the Church, especially the Protestant denominations, the vehicle which could most effectively preserve the national language, keep alive national aspirations, and strengthen the character of the people under oppression. The defeat of China by Japan on Korean soil, Japanese pressure on the King, and the murder of the Queen at Japanese instigation, all in 1895, gave birth to Korean nationalism, and subsequent aggression and domination continued to foster it.

After the Sino-Japanese War many persons gave up opposition to Western culture and sought to appropriate for Korea those same elements which seemed to be making Japan a great power. Christians were identified with the new patriotic reform movement from the outset. The missionaries, too, were in the public mind associated with Korean interests, for a number of them were very close to the royal family and some of them were said to have saved the life of the King.⁴³ Yun Chi Ho, who was appointed vice-minister of Education in 1896 and who edited a reform newspaper, was a leader of the Independence Club from its inception, and other prominent members were converted while in prison.⁴⁴

The political situation was in part responsible for the rapid growth of the Church after the Russo-Japanese War and the early years of Japanese "protection."⁴⁵ There were those who hoped to gain favors of justice from local magistrates by association with the

missionaries,⁴⁶ but the majority were drawn by spiritual considerations and by the hope that Christianity would bring about a true national revival. The American missionaries, possessed of their own peculiar ideas about separation of Church and State, non-interference in politics, and the supernationality of missions, have from this early period until today attempted to minimize the political factor, although they have had to acknowledge its existence. National Christians have been much more ready to acknowledge its importance. The missionaries were prone to explain the political motivation in these terms: "[The Korean] was conscious of a loss of status which made the possibility of becoming a 'child of God' and a citizen of a heavenly country particularly alluring."⁴⁷ Or again, it is said: "Though some few did try to use it for political purposes, the Christian Church was never a political society.... Another influence, apart from the political hope, which helped in the growth of the Church, was the fact that Christian missionaries were the most trusted friends of Korea in those days, from the King down to the common people. They had exerted themselves in Korea's behalf; gratitude and appreciation of such service opened Korean hearts to their message."⁴⁸ Dr. Alfred W. Wasson says of this period before annexation:

This revolutionary spirit found expression in various ways. It led some to engage in guerrilla warfare; others to turn to modern education as students or teachers or founders or supporters of schools; and still others to join the Christian Church and share its hope and join in its activities for bringing to Korea the blessings of the Kingdom of God. Patriotic men were drawn to the Church by its emphasis on education, its character building power, its stable organization, its world-wide connections, its democratic fellowship, and its suggestion of supernatural help. They saw in it an agency for natural well-being worthy of their support.⁴⁹

Mission schools were crowded, compared with government schools in which there could be no expression of patriotism.⁵⁰

However, the missionaries, convinced of the necessity of keeping the Church entirely out of politics, discouraged nationalism and endeavored to keep the converts from participation in anti-Japanese movements.⁵¹ The missionaries thought that they were being neutral and impartial, but in the eyes of Koreans they were committing themselves to the Japanese. George L. Paik states: "They strictly maintained morality, even when the Christian people suffered 'persecution.' But they 'assured the people.... that their duty was to obey the Japanese.... and not to work for independence.' The policy, therefore, was not non-committal, but definitely committal, even partisan."⁵² After the formal annexation of the country in 1910 the missionaries were even more careful to keep out of politics and not to

offend the Japanese officials. Perhaps this accounts for the retarded growth of the Church between annexation and World War I.

Nevertheless, despite the official position of the missionaries, the church members continued to find in the Church a refuge for their national language and hopes. The Japanese officers also, seeing so many Christians among the leaders of the national resistance movement, tended to identify the Church with opposition to Japanese rule. Increasing pressure was put on Christian schools, and the inclusion of religion within the curriculum was forbidden.⁵³ In the famous Korean Conspiracy Case of 1912-13, ninety-eight persons out of one hundred twenty-three accused were prominent Christians, and two missionaries were suspected.⁵⁴ The regulations of 1915 regarding registration and reporting by all persons engaged in propagating religion and requiring special permission for the erection of buildings appear to have been aimed specifically at the Christians, and under them church workers and clergy were continually harassed.⁵⁵ Christian participation in the demonstration for independence on March 1, 1919, being all out of proportion to their place in the total population, was very evident, and fifteen of the thirty-three signers of the "Independence Manifesto" were prominent Christian pastors.⁵⁶ Students from every Christian school staged demonstrations.⁵⁷ In the brutal reprisals which followed, the Church received excessive attention from the authorities. Police attended worship and reported on sermons. Some churches were burned and members killed. One missionary was tried and convicted for harboring students fleeing from arrest.⁵⁸ By the end of March nearly all the leaders were in prison. "Immediately the prison walls began to echo with singing and the cell became a house of prayer. Judging from the results one might say that the prison outside the west gate of Seoul was the greatest revival center in the country, a true theological hall in fact. Many who entered in darkness came out believers in Christ. This tendency only confirmed the belief of the Japanese that Christianity was persistently on the side of the offending Korean."⁵⁹ The result of all this was to fix even more firmly in the Korean mind that Christianity was their chief ally in the struggle for independence.⁶⁰ In this emergency, while still claiming to be politically neutral, the missionaries had been very vocal about the barbarous treatment of their brethren.⁶¹ Yet some who turned to Christianity with a political motivation became disillusioned, and about 1930 many students turned to Communism, saying that Christianity had failed to give them back their country.⁶²

During the decade of the 1930's government pressure steadily reduced the number of Protestant schools, and espionage on Christians was intensified. When Japan embarked on conquest in 1937,

the government was especially anxious about security in Korea. Participation in Shinto rites at shrines was now required of all schools. The Roman Catholic authorities applied the decision already taken in Japan, and their people participated in the rites.⁶³ Beginning with the Southern Presbyterians in 1937, the missions one after another began to close their schools or sell them to Korean organizations.⁶⁴ Some churches were ordered to make certain that their members first presented themselves at a shrine before attending Christian worship, and severe persecution attended refusal. Some however, complied, and this led to a degree of schism.⁶⁵ The National Christian Council "voluntarily" dissolved in 1938 and sent no delegation to Madras.⁶⁶ The government in that year also closed the national offices of the Y. M. C. A., Y. W. C. A., and other organizations, and ordered affiliation with the corresponding bodies in Japan.⁶⁷ Attempts to force the denominations to merge with their sister bodies in Japan did not succeed, but in 1945 the government demanded the formation of a single Protestant body. An informal constitution assembly of the "Japanese Church of Christ" was held on July tenth, bringing together the Presbyterians, Methodists, and Salvation Army. August first was set for the date of inauguration but nothing was done because of the confusion caused by the impending collapse of Japan, and the organization never functioned.⁶⁸

Since the end of World War II the identification of the Christian Church with Korean nationalism in the troubled times of war, division, and Communist invasion has been manifested in many ways, including the systematic slaughter of pastors and lay leaders by invading Communist forces and the growth in church membership in a twelve-year period from 400,000 to 1,000,000.⁶⁹ It is of interest that a Christian museum has been erected on the site of the chief Shinto shrine in Korea.⁷⁰

The strategic response of the Christian mission to nationalistic pressure has followed three main lines: recruiting and training an indigenous clergy to whom the control of the churches is committed, fostering the adjustment of the Church and Christian community to the indigenous culture, and an attempt to establish the supranationality of the missionary.

A tremendous impetus was given to the promotion of the cause of the indigenous clergy by Pope Benedict XV in his encyclical, *Maximum Illud* of November 30, 1919, which set forth that ideal with great urgency. This was also a matter very much on the heart of the great missionary Pontiff, Pius XI, whose encyclical, *Rerum Ecclesiae* (Feb. 28, 1926), made this work a primary duty of the mission and stressed the importance of a native hierarchy. The encyclical, *Evangelii Praecones* (June 21, 1951), of Pope Pius XII

is evidence of the central place which this policy continues to hold. The result has been a steady increase in the number and proportion of native clergy, brothers, and sisters, accompanied by the multiplication of seminaries and even of new native orders. Statistics for the clergy and lay religions in the years just after the close of the war (1947-1949) reveal the extent of progress.⁷¹ Examples are:

Country	Priests		Brothers		Sisters	
	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign	Native	Foreign
China	2,542	3,046	663	414	4,717	2,036
Korea	163	89	7	29	1,443	85
Japan	181	414	139	103	1,538	659
Vietnam	1,430	336	559	42	4,243	294

A parallel development took place in Protestant missions in keeping with the policy of fostering the growth of "self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating churches" generally accepted since the middle of the nineteenth century. Every national, regional, and world missionary conference in the twentieth century placed first, or at least very high among priorities, the recruiting and training of the indigenous ministry. The supply, however, has never caught up with the demand. The following figures for 1949 may be compared with the Roman Catholic figures.⁷² China (excluding Manchuria and Formosa): 2,024 native pastors, compared with 899 ordained missionaries; 6,028 national lay workers and 1,362 foreigners; 2,396 national women workers and 1,682 foreigners. Korea: pastors, 258 nationals compared with 69 foreigners; laymen, 405 nationals and 122 foreigners; women workers, 135 nationals and 114 foreigners. Japan in that year had 3,162 ordained clergy and a total missionary staff of ministers and laity of about 450.

"Devolution" or the transfer of control from the mission organization to the responsible national church body accompanied the rise of a more adequate native clergy in Protestant strategy. This was urged in every ecumenical conference until Whitby, when the process had progressed so far that the usual admonition was changed from devolution to "partnership in obedience" between younger and older churches. The counterpart of devolution in the Roman Catholic mission is the establishment of national hierarchies with native bishops. China led the way in this development, and the older vicariates were divided until there were one hundred fifty ecclesiastical circumscriptions arranged in twenty provinces, each with an archdiocese and several dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures.⁷³ A Nunciature was established at Peking in 1946. The first six Chinese bishops were consecrated in 1926 together in Rome, and others constantly were added to their ranks. Archbishop T'ien was elevated to the dignity

of cardinal. The first native Japanese bishop was consecrated to the see of Nagasaki in 1927, and ten years later the Church in that land received its first native metropolitan in the person of Archbishop Doi of Tokyo. All foreign bishops offered their resignations in the autumn of 1940, and since then the Japanese hierarchy has been entirely under native leadership.⁷⁴ The situation varies somewhat from country to country, but these examples illustrate the general development.

The adjustment of the life of the Christian community and the cultus of the Church to the indigenous culture and the national economic base was another answer to nationalism as well as a long time objective of the mission. The large fifth volume of the Madras Conference Series is evidence of the importance of this objective in Protestant planning.⁷⁵ Korea, where the Nevius Method had been employed, had the best record of self-support in the Far East. The long standing Roman Catholic policy of assuring support by building up endowments and rents from lands and buildings released the Church from a measure of foreign support, but it also had the effect of making the Church as a large landlord the target of suspicion. The long enduring effects of the Rites Controversy of the eighteenth century and the universally fixed aspects of doctrine, liturgy, and polity limited the areas in which Roman Catholics might experiment in adaptation, but Protestant denominations, despite their theoretical freedom of action, did no more. Neither branch of the Church has really accomplished much in this field in the Far East. A beginning has been made, however, in architecture, painting, sculpture, music, rites, and festivals. Perhaps the outstanding example has been the creation of a school of Christian painting originally sponsored by Archbishop Costantini and centering at Fu Jon University in Peking.⁷⁶ A Chinese Catholic Cultural Association was founded in 1941 for the purpose of "baptizing" Chinese culture.⁷⁷

Another reaction to nationalistic movements was the development of a claim to supranationality for Protestant missionaries, similar to that which the Roman Catholic missionary might claim as the servant of a universal Church in a mission supervised from Rome. The Protestant missionary also based his claim on being the servant of a world-wide Church. Something of American and European free-church ideas about the separation of Church and State and the avoidance of politics also entered into this thinking, as did the internationalism of the 1920's. The expropriation of mission property and the expulsion or internment of missionaries as enemy aliens by both Western and Eastern governments in both World Wars stimulated the effort. The support of "orphaned missions" by the Propaganda, the International Missionary Council, and the Lutheran World Fed-

eration was a practical demonstration of the supranationality which was claimed. Not only because the mission had suffered under aggressive nationalism but also because many missionaries had placed their knowledge at the service of their own governments during the war, the Whitby Conference issued a document on "The Supranationality of Missions."⁷⁸ Characteristically, as in most cases in the last quarter century, this document is more concerned to awaken sensitivity in the missionary toward his supranational obligations than to guard him against nationalistic interference.

1. *Report of the Ecumenical Missionary Conference*, New York, 1900, Vol. I, pp. 415-16.
2. *The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War*, pp. 222-23.
3. *Report of the Ecumenical Missionary Conference*, New York, 1900, Vol. I, pp. 292-93; 399.
4. *World Missionary Conference*, Edinburgh, 1910, Vol. I, p. 32.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 35.
7. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 201-02.
8. *Ibid.*, Vol. III, p. 6.
9. *The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War*, pp. 3-7.
10. (International Missionary Council), *The World Mission of Christianity: Messages and Recommendations of the Enlarged Meeting of the I. M. C., Jerusalem, 1928*, p. 7.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 15, see also Section XI, "The Christian Mission and War," p. 73.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 17-22.
14. *The World-wide Christian Mission*, 1922-1932 (reprinted from *International Review of Missions*, Vol. XXI, Nos. 81, 82, 83), pp. 275-276.
15. (Laymen's Foreign Missions Inquiry), *Re-Thinking Missions*, pp. 22-24.
16. (International Missionary Council), *World Mission of the Church*, pp. 17-18, 42-43.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
18. See Latourette, K. S., and Hogg, W. R., *World Christian Community in Action: The Story of World War II and Orphaned Missions*.
19. Ranson, C. W., Ed., *Renewal and Advance* (Whitby 1947); Goodall, Norman, ed., *Missions Under the Cross* (Willingen, 1952); *The Christian Prospect in East Asia* (Bangkok, 1949); Manikam, Rajah B., ed., *Christianity and the Asian Revolution*.
20. Manikam, R. B., ed., *Christianity and the Asian Revolution*, p. 114.
21. *World Missionary Conference*, 1910, Vol. IV, p. 230. This charge that Christianity is unpatriotic is met from first to last in the history of the mission in Japan. On the rapid growth in the 1880's see: Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VI, pp. 390 ff.
22. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VI, pp. 395 ff.
23. Laures, Johannes, S. J., *The Catholic Church in Japan*, p. 243.
24. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VII, pp. 380-81.
25. *World Missionary Conference*, 1910, Vol. III, p. 121.
26. Laures, *The Catholic Church in Japan*, pp. 240-41.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 243. On Christianity and Shinto see Holtom, D. C., *Modern Japan and Shinto Nationalism*, pp. 98 ff.
28. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VII, p. 396.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 385-86; Laures, *The Catholic Church in Japan*, p. 244.
30. *World Christian Handbook*, 1949, p. 115.
31. *Ibid.*
32. General Headquarters, Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, *Religions in Japan*, p. 172. The Occupation authorities here report Orthodox church membership to be only 13,990.
33. *The Christian Prospect in East Asia*, p. 34.
34. *World Missionary Conference*, 1910, Vol. I, p. 96; Vol. III, p. 68, 84-85; Vol. IX, pp. 242 ff.
35. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China*, pp. 694 ff, 812 ff.
36. Stauffer, Milton J., secretary and editor, *The Christian Occupation of China; Shanghai, China Continuation Committee*, 1922.
37. *Christian Education in China*; New York, Committee of Reference and Counsel of the Foreign Missions Conference of N. A. 1922.
38. Peake, Cyrus H., *Nationalism and Education in Modern China*; p. 149, see: Gregg, Alice, *China and Educational Autonomy*, for the detailed story of mission-government relations in education and accompanying agitation.
39. Gregg, Alice, *China and Educational Autonomy*, p. 139.

40. Latourette, *A History of Christian Missions in China*, pp. 689, 820.
41. (I. M. C.), *The Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council*, Vol. II, 141; Vol. VIII, pp. 56, 66-67.
42. See *World Christian Handbook*, 1949, and 1952 editions for statistics; but the figures given are low. Statistics gathered by the National Christian Council in 1950 indicated just about 1,000,000 Protestant communicant members.
43. Paik, L. George, *History of Protestant Missions in Korea, 1832-1910*, p. 233-34; Rhodes, J., ed., *History of the Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.*, 1884-1934, pp. 492-497.
44. Wasson, A. W., *Church Growth in Korea*, pp. 10-12, 48.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 51 ff.
46. Paik, L. G., *History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, pp. 249-50.
47. Wasson, A. W., *Church Growth in Korea*, p. 50.
48. Van Buskirk, James A., *Korea Land of Dawn*, p. 44.
49. Wasson, *Church Growth in Korea*, p. 75. For recent change of view, see Ranson, C. W., ed., *Renewal and Advance*, p. 40.
50. Paik, *A History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, pp. 393-94.
51. Rhodes, H. A., ed., *A History of the Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church*, pp. 498 ff; Blair, W. N. *The Korea Pentecost*, pp. 39, 40; Paik, *History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, pp. 399-403.
52. Paik, *History of Protestant Missions in Korea*, p. 402.
53. Wasson, *Church Growth in Korea*, pp. 83-85.
54. *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91; Rhodes, ed., *History of the Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 499.
55. *Ibid.*, pp. 91-92.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 99; Rhodes, ed., *History of the Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 500.
57. *Ibid.*, 101.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
59. *The Missionary Outlook in the Light of the War*, p. 123.
60. *Ibid.*, p. 124; Wasson, *Church Growth in Korea*, p. 101.
61. Rhodes, ed., *History of the Korea Mission of the Presbyterian Church*, p. 501.
62. Wasson, *Church Growth in Korea*, p. 140.
63. Latourette, *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VII, p. 403.
64. *Ibid.*, p. 406; (International Missionary Council), *Madras Series*, Vol. II, pp. 150-151.
65. *Ibid.*, p. 406.
66. International Missionary Council, *Madras Series*, Vol. II, p. 152.
67. Latourette, K. S., *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, Vol. VII, p. 407.
68. *World Christian Handbook*, 1949, pp. 124-25.
69. *Christianity and the Asian Revolution*, p. 267, states losses by death to be 500 Protestant pastors and 5,000 laymen.
70. *The Christian Prospect in East Asia*, p. 41.
71. *Le Missioni Cattoliche*, 1950, various tables.
72. *World Christian Handbook*, 1949, various tables.
73. *Ibid.*, 1952, p. 106.
74. Laures, J., *Catholic Church in Japan*, pp. 237, 241, 244.
75. [International Missionary Council], *Madras Series*, Vol. V, "The Economic Basis of the Church;" see also: Davis, J. Merle, *New Buildings on Old Foundations*.
76. Schüller, Sepp, *Neue Christliche Mission in China*; and see also numerous other publications on the subject.
77. Yu-Pin, Bishop Paul, *Eyes East*, pp. 120 ff.
78. Ranson, C. W., ed., *Renewal and Advance*, pp. 219-21.

CHILIASM AND THE HUSSITE REVOLUTION

HOWARD KAMINSKY, *University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee*

"... non estimemus fabulam illam quasi veram, quam quidam dicunt, quod instabat seculum bonum, in quo nullus erit malorum, et quod nihil paciantur, sed gaudio ineffabili sint prediti." (From a Taborite commentary on *Apocalypse*, c. 1425.)

In the years following John Hus' martyrdom the movement he had led developed from a Prague University reform movement into a national reformation.¹ Ideas that had formerly existed as topics for discussion among university intellectuals were established as actual religious practice among large groups of people, of all estates and with widely varying interests and viewpoints. As each such group entered the national movement it necessarily contributed its own viewpoint, with the result that every extension of the reform involved almost as many difficulties for the Hussites as for the Catholics. Of course there had always been differences among the university masters themselves, the inevitable conservative-radical dichotomy based ultimately on differences of spiritual temperament that exist within any group. But far more significant was the *social* polarization that took form as the concept of reform held by the upper estates was opposed by programs deriving from the point of view of artisans, peasants, and "the poor."

The rejection of the Roman system by the upper orders in Bohemia involved on the one hand certain changes in religious practice (chiefly the return to utraquist communion), and on the other the secularization of church property and the replacement of the Roman-controlled hierarchy with a national church under the patronage of the feudalism and bourgeoisie and under the doctrinal authority of the University. This concept of the reform did not presuppose a formal break with Rome and certainly not a withdrawal from the European religious community; on the contrary, the conservative Hussites did all they could to stay within this community — which was their own — and win it over to reform. But when the lower orders entered the reform movement they brought with them an accumulated hatred of the Roman Church, both as a feudal lord and as a greedy and corrupt institution, ever ready to squeeze payments from the faithful to support the pomp of ritual, the luxury of prelates, and the sinful lives led by many of the clergy at all levels. The early Church had not been so exalted, so complex, or so worldly; the comparison of the Roman system with the Primitive Church, a fundamental Hussite idea, took on an almost savage quality in the minds of the lower estates. Thus even as early as 1415 we find the emergence of a

context of ideas and attitudes precisely like that of Waldensianism, the popular heresy *par excellence* of the Middle Ages, and while scholars do not all agree that these tendencies can be traced to actual Waldensian influences in Bohemia, it is hard to avoid characterizing the sectarian Hussitism in question as Waldensianist in nature.²

For about four years the potential split between "orthodox" and sectarian Hussites was contained within the unified national movement. For one thing that movement had won the favor of leading Czech barons and the benign neutrality of King Wenceslas IV, so that the years 1415-1418 saw the establishment of reform all through Bohemia and into Moravia, the secular powers exercising their rights of patronage in favor of Hussite priests, even radical ones. At the same time, while official Hussite doctrine, under the leadership of the university master Jakoubek of Stríbro, continued to accept the basic elements of the Catholic world-view, it developed a practical radicalism that made possible the application of even sectarian reforms while the scholastic framework of University Hussitism remained intact.

But in early 1419 the conditions for this working arrangement came to an end. King Wenceslas began a new policy of Catholic restoration; ultraquist communion was tolerated but there could be no Hussite agitation and no extension of the reform beyond ultraquism. Those whose concept of reform was predicated on the cooperation of the secular powers felt that they had to obey the royal decree; they formed a politically conservative party which included even the religiously radical Jakoubek. But more militant radicals in Prague were unwilling to give up their gains or their freedom to propagate their ideas, while the radicals in the provinces, often unable even to enter their parish churches unless they renounced ultraquism, were virtually forced to resist. In south Bohemia, long the most active center of popular heresy and then of radical Hussitism, the radical priests organized congregations outside the parish system, on open hilltops, where they gave ultraquist communion and preached vigorous evangelical sermons against the Roman system. The spirit of these congregations was a conscious imitation of evangelical and apostolic Christianity, with an emphasis on Christian pacifism, brotherly love, and such practical acts as the sharing of food. As groups of regular, perhaps even permanent, congregants took shape there emerged the rudiments of a really new life, one held together by love rather than by institutions based on force. The effect was to create a new social foundation for the radical party; those who felt alienated from the established social system and whose religious ideas constituted a rejection of that system in principle had now taken the final step of building a kind of social existence wholly outside the feudal order. The center of these mass congregations was a hill near

Bechyně castle that the radicals renamed "Mt. Tabor," after the mountain in Galilee where Jesus was supposed to have spoken with his disciples and to have appeared to them after his death.³ The congregants themselves became known as Taborites.

Although the original creation of these congregations had been an expression of the sectarian spirit of withdrawal from the world, the priests and petty nobles who came to lead the movement were still thinking in terms of an established national reformation rather than some sectarian dream of perfection. Very soon, indeed, the congregations were given nationwide organization and scope, so that certain meetings took on the character of national assemblies, where religious observance was associated with political planning. Out of the separate world of the hilltops there emerged a schismatic religio-political program designed to bring about a national reformation in defiance of Wenceslas' Catholicizing policies. Even in the King's lifetime there was talk at the congregations of electing a Hussite bishop and a Hussite prince; after Wenceslas' death, on August 16, 1419, these projects became a definite political program. At the beginning of October and again in early November congregants from all over the kingdom were brought together in Prague itself, where the radical leaders urged their policies on the Hussite magistrates and university masters.

But the conservatives, still loyal to the principle of legitimacy, sought to secure the succession of Wenceslas' brother, the Emperor Sigismund, on condition that he grant freedom to Hussitism and secure a European hearing for the reform. He was indeed the only man who could conceivably do the latter. The Hussite barons joined with their Catholic colleagues to form a royalist party, committed to preserving the *status quo* while waiting for Sigismund to enter the realm, and they urged the Prague magistrates to adhere to this party. On one occasion the radicals were able to bring the city into open war with the royalists, but this success only pushed the burghers more powerfully into the arms of the party of order, and on November 13, 1419 Prague concluded a truce with the royalists, by which the latter would insure the freedom of ultraquism in return for Prague's cession of the important Vyšehrad fortress south of the city, and her promise to stop radical attacks on churches, monasteries, and images, and to see that the Taborites left the city.

* * * * *

The truce of November 13, which was to last until April 24, 1420, completed the isolation of the provincial radicals, already begun with the congregations of 1419. The radicals who returned to the provinces from Prague after the truce had no political ties binding them to the

national movement, no possibility of achieving political results within the framework of Hussite unity, and no reason to regard the conservatives with any emotion kinder than hatred. And if any of them were not ready to reject the Prague world of ideas, the ensuing events of the winter provided the final argument, for the truce of November 13 was the signal for a savage persecution of non-royalist Hussites throughout Bohemia. A contemporary Hussite chronicler has described it vividly:⁴

In these times therefore the faithful Czechs, both clergy and laity, who favored communion in both kinds and devotedly promoted it, and who grieved at the unjust death of Master John Hus . . . suffered very great difficulties, tribulations, anguish, and torment throughout the Kingdom of Bohemia, at the hands of the enemies and blasphemers of the Truth, who grievously afflicted them by plundering their property, by subjecting them to hard sorts of captivity, to hunger and thirst, and by slaughtering their bodies. For these enemies of the Truth hunted down priests and laymen who ardently supported the chalice in various parts of the realm and brought them to the men of Kutná Hora, to whom they sold some for money. The Kutná Horans—Germans and cruel persecutors and enemies of the Czechs, especially of those loving the Truth of Christ—afflicted them with various blasphemies and diverse sorts of punishments, and inhumanly threw them—some alive, some first decapitated—into deep mine shafts, especially into the mine shaft near the Church of St. Martin near the Kourím Gate, which shaft the Kutná Horans called “Tabor” . . . In a short time more than 1600 ultraquists were killed by them and thrown into the shafts, the executioners often being exhausted by the fatigues of slaughter.

The radicals could either suffer themselves to be exterminated or they could resist and, by taking up arms in defense of Hussitism against the royalist feudalism, create a new total situation, one in which the reform would pass over into revolution. In the course of the winter precisely such a situation emerged. By early 1420 the campaign of extermination against the “Wyclyfites”—a generic term signifying, at this point, those Hussites who did not abide by the policy of the November truce — ceased to be the affair merely of royalist barons and German burghers; Sigismund himself had turned his attention to the Bohemian problem and was directing the battle against the rebels. While Hussite Prague was deliberately humbling herself before Sigismund for the sake of her conservative concept of reform,⁵ the Emperor was urging his loyal subjects to “persecute and as far as possible exterminate” all Wyclyfites.⁶ The latter maintained their defiance in certain urban bastions — particularly Plzeň and Klatovy in the southwest, Písek in the south, Hradec Králové in the northeast, and, perhaps, the towns of Žatec, Louny, and Slaný in the northwest.⁷

It is precisely at this time that the sources show the beginnings of

the chiliast movement. The reliable Master Laurence of Březová notes, just after his entry for January 9, 1420:⁸

During this time certain Taborite priests were preaching to the people a new coming of Christ, in which all evil men and enemies of the Truth would perish and be exterminated, while the good would be preserved in five cities. For this reason certain cities in which communion in both kinds could freely be given refused to enter into any agreement with the enemy, and especially the city of Plzeň.

For these Taborite priests in the district of Bechyně and elsewhere were deceiving the people in a remarkable way with their preaching, advancing many erroneous doctrines contrary to the Christian faith, by falsely interpreting the prophetic books according to their own heads and by despising the Catholic doctrines of the holy doctors. They urged that all those desiring to be saved from the wrath of almighty God, which in their view was about to be visited on the whole globe, should leave their cities, castles, villages, and towns, as Lot left Sodom, and should go to the five cities of refuge. These are the names of the five: Plzeň, which they called the City of the Sun, Žatec, Louny, Slaný, and Klatovy.⁹ For Almighty God wished to destroy the whole world, saving only those who had taken refuge in the five cities. They alleged in support of this doctrine prophetic texts falsely and erroneously understood. Also, they sent letters containing this material through the Kingdom of Bohemia. And many simple folk, accepting these frivolous doctrines as true, and having zeal, as the Apostle says, but not acting through knowledge, sold their property, taking even a low price, and flocked to these priests from various parts of the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Margravate of Moravia, with their wives and children, and they threw their money at the feet of the priests.

Laurence's account suggests that the preaching did not at this point focus attention on the new age that would succeed the predicted Day of Wrath; arbitrarily reserving the word "chiliasm" for the whole movement, we can distinguish between an initial *adventism* and a subsequent *millenarianism*. The task of adventist propaganda was to separate the people from the established order; how difficult it was appears from a contemporary song:¹⁰

Faithful ones, rejoice in God! Give Him honor and praise, that He has pleased to preserve us and graciously liberate us from the evil Antichrist and his cunning army . . .

Take no heed of the faithless ones and do not follow them for Satan draws them in his train, away from endurance. . . . Many will excuse themselves and depart from the feast, some to look at their villages, others to try out their oxen, and still others to embrace women. To such Christ has promised that . . . they will be deprived of the eternal feast. Therefore fear this and let us endure with him to the end, always keeping in mind the reward that Christ will give to the one who stays with him to the end and does not leave him on account of some suffering, or some whim, or booty of some sort. [The faithful must not grumble.] . . . Give us [the strength] not to look back as Lot's wife did. . . . And Christ mentioned her when he spoke of his coming and commanded flight to the mountains; he said: Who is then on the roof, let him not come down, and who is in the fields, let him not look back. Remember Lot's wife, that faithless daughter, who looked at her home.

Lord Christ, make us have strong faith in you so that we may conquer, firmly staying with you, O living and most worthy Bread, until we come into heaven, joyfully singing Amen, rejoicing with the Lord God, and ruling with Him forever.

The kind of battle that was being fought for the minds of the provincial radicals is more fully illustrated by the chiliast letters, referred to by Laurence. An early example reads:¹¹

Dearest brothers in God! Know that the time of greatest suffering has already drawn near . . . the time about which Christ in his Scriptures, and his apostles in their epistles, and the prophets, as well as St. John in the Apocalypse, have prophesied. In this time the Lord God commands His elect to flee from the midst of the evil ones. . . . But where are God's elect to flee? To fortified cities that the Lord God has provided in the time of greatest suffering. . . . And there are five of these cities, which will not enter into agreements with the Antichrist or surrender to him. . . .

The lion has gone forth from his lair and the heathen pillager has arisen, that is, against God and His Law; just as the King of Hungary [Sigismund], who has plundered many pagans, has gone forth from his city, that is, from Hungary, in order to lay waste your land. Your cities will be wiped out and remain without inhabitants. Therefore, knowing these things, give diligent heed to the Lord God Himself and do not be tardy; He is at the gates. . . . Do not let yourselves be turned here and there by unbelieving seducers who say, "This will not happen in our time," it has already been fulfilled, and God knows when it will happen. . . . Therefore you, if you are faithful, do not scorn holy prophecies. For the Lord God says through the prophet Amos in chapter ix [10]: "All the sinners of my people will die on the sword who say, 'It will [not] approach and the evil will not come on us'"—like those who say [now]: "It will not be in our time nor in the time of our children." God's mercy be with you. Amen.

The "unbelieving seducers" included above all the Prague masters, who naturally sought to keep the reform within their world of ideas. Their resistance to chiliiasm was undoubtedly sharpened by the fact that the chiliasts called Prague Babylon — it was, in truth, associated with the royalists—and urged the citizens of the capital to flee their doomed city and join the radical congregations.¹² In letters to their provincial contacts and in official statements requested by perplexed Hussites, the university masters conducted a vigorous anti-chiliast polemic, some of the more interesting passages of which follow:¹³

The priests should take care not to preach to the people in a presumptuous spirit that a horrible disaster is about to visit the people, assigning a time for it on their own and criminally keeping the people in a state of suspense, without themselves having had any certain divine revelation about this.

[The priests should] exhort the people, publicly and privately, not to leave their dwelling-places. . . . The evangelical priests would do well to live evangelically, thus teaching the people and destroying sins in them, but relinquishing these presumptions of theirs.

The common people, urged on by the priests, are taking up carnal and secular arms against the enemy. . . . Let the subject people beware, lest

they usurp the sword from the higher powers, against God, not having any certain and special revelation. The *higher* powers can legitimately wage war, but they expose themselves to great perils of the soul in so doing . . .

We affirm that the faithful are permitted to congregate [for the honor of God, etc.] . . . But as God is our witness, it is not our intention in asserting this truth to offer any occasion for rapine, plundering, or homicide, or the destruction of churches and parish-houses. . . . [The congregations should be] made in the church rather than in deserted fields or on mountains—particularly where scandal . . . and peril may probably be feared.

Another surviving chiliast letter seems to be striking back against just these arguments, which must have carried powerful weight, reinforcing as they did the natural disinclination of the people to break with not only the existing social order but also the whole past tradition of the Hussite movement. The chiliast prophet wrote:¹⁴

May God be with you and please to enlighten and comfort your souls in your sorrows and sufferings. Dearest brothers and sisters in God! See this hard, terrible, and dangerous time, prophesied by Christ, by the apostles, and by the holy prophets, which time is called that of the greatest wrath, and which is to be particularly known, according to Christ, by many various and concealed seductions, by battles and supposed battles. For many are now aggrieved against Christ's commands, *supposing that it is not necessary to carry on a regular fight with a physical sword* against evils and abominations, against errors and heresy. But Christ has said: do not be grieved when you hear battles and struggles; these things must be, as the holy prophets prophesied. . . . And Christ also makes this time known by conflicts, by many scandals, by the spread of evil, by many oppressions, by destruction, by abomination in the holy place—that is, sins, idols . . . and other disorders abominable to God, by torments, by imprisonment, and primarily by the killing of God's elect. . . . In this time Christ gives the special command to his faithful ones, to flee not only from sins, but also from the midst of evil, hostile, and insincere people; and he says: flee to the mountains, *that is, to the faithful people*. . . .

Do not say then: "What, are we to flee before God? Wherever the just man dies, there he dies well."¹⁵ That is sometimes the truth but not always. [Lot was ordered to flee Sodom even though he was a good man.] Christ also orders us [like Lot] *not to look back on homes, on estates, on any material things*, and not to believe the seducers who say that wherever the just man dies, he dies well. For Christ says: then they will say to you that Christ is here or he is there, but do not believe it; that is, if they say that a man needs only to flee from sins for Christ to be merciful to him, in a village or in a city, that is a great deception. For Christ says, further: false prophets will arise and will give signs and miracles, so that the elect too may be led into error, if that were possible.

And what are the great signs that the false Christians and false prophets give? *These[people] can be, outstandingly, personages who are [university] masters and nobles*; it is evident that they have seemed to be something, and they are nothing. Thus they mislead God's elect, saying that the masters do not hold this, nor do the lords, only . . . those eccentrics who expound things from their own heads. And indeed they themselves mislead the simple people . . . as when they say to the people who

are moved by the Word of God to abandon and take no thought for their property, "Do not leave your property, they are deceiving you." This is obviously against Scripture, which says: Whoever leaves home, brothers, sisters, father or mother, or land and field for my name, will win a hundred times more and will obtain eternal life.

[Christ's] disciples asked him. . . . "Where, O Lord?" And he said: "Where the Body will be, there the eagles will gather." Therefore brothers and sisters, *where you know Christ's Body to be given with all the pieces of God's Truths*, there gather in the time of vengeance and greatest suffering. And in that time those places cannot be in a village or elsewhere, on account of the strong and dreadful Antichrist, but in *fortified cities*, of which St. Isaiah names five. . . . Therefore it is necessary to congregate without delay, to fast and weep for your own sins and those of others, to pray day and night to the Lord God, crying out to Him that He should please to save you in the times of greatest suffering. And also to fit yourselves, with [the help of] God's Word, for good examples and counsels, and particularly in order to fill yourselves with the precious food and drink of Lord Jesus Christ. . . .

* * * * *

It is clear that this adventist preaching of the earliest period — January and February — continued the older Taborite congregation-movement in many ways: the radicals were urged to gather on the mountains to take ultraquist communion and listen to the Word of God. But there were essential differences: the congregations were no longer periodic events, from which the masses might return to their villages, but permanent communities; the main purpose of these communities was not communion and preaching, nor the political aim of a national reformation, but self-preservation in an imminent period of catastrophe, the battle between Christ and Antichrist that would end the existing Age; the meetings were not to be permeated with the spirit of evangelical pacifism but with the readiness to fight with the physical sword. It is also interesting that at least some chiliast letters specifically noted that the "mountains" were to be understood as, simply, the congregations, or more specifically still, five cities.

To contemporaries the most striking change was that from pacifism to an ideology of warfare. In a letter written sometime before February 10 to the chiliast prophet Master John of Jičín, formerly a close associate of Hus' and Jakoubek's in the university reform movement, Jakoubek asked: "Did you [priests] not formerly preach against killing, and how then has everything now come to be turned into its opposite?"¹⁶ The layman Peter Chelčický, who had probably been a Taborite in 1419 but who refused to give up his Waldensianist condemnation of violence, killing, and secular power, also addressed himself to this problem. In his *On Spiritual Battle*, written about 1421, he reviewed the whole development of Taboritism as he saw it:¹⁷

... to our great shame and sorrow, we must acknowledge how our brethren have been cleverly seduced by Satan, and how they have departed from Holy Scriptures in strange and unheard-of ideas and acts. When Satan first came to them it was not with an open face, as the Devil, but in the shining garb of voluntary poverty, which Christ commanded priests to hold to, and in the zealous work of preaching to and serving the people and in giving them the Body and Holy Blood of God. And all of this flourished to the point that a great many people flocked to them. Then the Devil came to them clothed in other garb, in the prophets and the Old Testament, and from these they sought to confect an imminent Day of Judgement, saying that they were angels who had to eliminate all scandals from Christ's Kingdom, and that they were to judge the world. And so they committed many killings and impoverished many people, but they did not judge the world according to their words, for the predicted time has elapsed with which they terrified the people, telling them strange things which they collected from many prophets.

This statement seems to mean that the earlier congregations, as blameless as their transactions seemed, were still the origin of what Chelcický regarded as the openly evil chiliast congregations. Indeed he argued generally in the tractate as a whole that man cannot do good or persist in a good course by his own virtues; as soon as he ceases to rely absolutely on divine support he lays himself open to the Devil. Chelcický thought that few men could avoid this trap,¹⁸ and so he must have seen the fundamental fault of the congregations of 1419 in their very success as mass movements. By reaching outside of the narrow limits within which sectarian ideals of perfection can be safely pursued, the congregations degenerated morally to the point where their reaction to persecution, in the winter of 1419-1420, was not the Christian suffering of the New Testament but the self-conscious violence of the Old.

Chelcický was not the only radical to resist the new Taborite ideas. Many Hussites wondered whether the new, permanent congregations were justified at all, and they turned to the recognized arbiters of doctrinal truth, the Prague University masters.¹⁹ Could "the faithful come together in time of persecution," "for the honor of God, the edification of the Church, and the promotion of the evangelical Truth?" To take a poignant case, could "a wife who is of the faithful leave a husband who is not, for Christ and his gospel?" And could pious Christians take the sword? And even if it was permissible for secular lords to fight in defense of the Truth, the question arose, "whether, if the secular lords are so lax that they are unwilling to defend the Truth with sword in hand, the faithful subject communities may and ought to defend that Truth with the material sword?" Obviously, those who asked such questions were torn between two desires: on the one hand was their unwillingness to step outside the main Hussite tradition and the scholastic world of ideas; on the other hand were the urgent demands of Hussite

self-defense, to which only the Taborite preachers seemed to be doing justice.

The Prague masters, evidently relying on Wyclif's doctrine of the loss of "dominion" through sin, sought to supply a doctrine of legitimate revolution.²⁰

We concede that secular lords can resist God and His Law so much that their power may be removed by God Himself, and it would then be permitted to the communities, admitted to this work by God, to defend the evangelical Truth in a practical and not fantastic way.

But they at once began to pile on reservations:

But there must always be preserved the proper order, consonant with the Law of Christ, as this is indicated by divine instinct, certain revelation, or reliable evidence. Moreover, care must be taken that no one assert, forwardly and too precipitantly, that the lords have been deprived of their power just because they have refused to go along with every vagrant wind. And further, communities can and should defend the Truth by helping their lords. It is neither safe nor just that the common people take on a task that does not belong to them, particularly when they have lords in whom there is no defect so evident, notable, or incorrigible that the only way justice can be secured is for the people themselves to engage in a task that is not only difficult but full of perils and snares.

And some weeks later they warned that their justification of war should not be taken as a license, "as some now suppose," to destroy cloisters, churches, and parish houses, or to plunder.²¹

Since there did emerge various non-chiliast and non-Taborite centers of resistance to Sigismund, it may be supposed that the Prague rescripts had a certain influence in helping these Hussites pass from the older reliance on established authority to their new posture of independent action. But the Taborite movement developed its own theoretical framework, quite outside the scholastic body of thought. By virtue of the new coming of Christ and the end of the *seculum*, all aspects of the medieval order were reduced to meaninglessness; what became meaningful, concretely, was the new world of the elect. It is this world that must now be studied.

* * * * *

The first great hope of the Taborites was Plzeň, the "City of the Sun" in chiliast propaganda. The Plzeň radicals, led by the priest Wenceslas Koranda and the baron Lord Břeněk of Skála, had played the leading role in organizing the great political congregations that had met in Prague during the autumn; after the November truce these contingents returned to Plzeň. With them, however, came powerful new forces determined not to accept the truce; the combined forces were led by John

Žižka, Lord Břeněk of Skála, Lord Valkoun of Adlar, and several members of the lower nobility. A typical radical program of destruction of monasteries and some churches was put into effect, and there was chiliast preaching.²² "One day," Koranda preached, "we'll get up in the morning and see all the others lying dead, with their noses pointing up in the air."²³ But this pleasure was not enjoyed by the Plzeň Taborites; quickly attacked and then besieged by the royalists, and faced with a predominantly hostile citizenry, the Taborites in the city could hold out only until about March 20, 1420. After its surrender and evacuation by the Taborites, Plzeň became a Catholic bastion and remained so for the rest of the Hussite period.

It was in south Bohemia that Taborite chiliiasm found its political success. It will be recalled that Laurence of Březová stated that in the first part of January "certain Taborite priests" were preaching adventist sermons "in the district of Bechyně and elsewhere." The Taborite center of this region, which had had a long history of sectarian heresy, had previously been the city of Ústí-nad-Lužnicí, whose radical leaders had organized the first congregations of 1419 after they had been driven out of the city. They seem to have returned, for the Taborite contingents in Prague during the autumn included one from Ústí.²⁴ This group may have returned to the city after the truce, but if so they were probably driven out by the anti-Hussite Lord Ulrich of Ústí as part of the royalist war on the radicals.²⁵ In view of the insistence of at least one adventist agitator on congregating in walled cities rather than in the open, we can probably suppose that the Ústí contingent sought such a city.

All the available evidence suggests that *the* walled chiliast city of south Bohemia was Písek, which had long been a center of sectarian radicalism.²⁶ In the early adventist preaching, before the "five cities" had become more than a concept, the people were urged to congregate in Plzeň and in Písek;²⁷ as of February 10, 1420 — but doubtless long before — the latter city was the only important center of "Wyclifite" resistance in south Bohemia.²⁸ And Master John Příbram, in an explicitly historical presentation of the progress of chiliast ideology, confined his account of the actual formation of the chiliast type of community to what had taken place in Písek:²⁹

The Taborite priests, . . . not satisfied with having deceived such a great number of people in so ugly a way in regard to their souls, their faith, and their property, immediately thought up another disgraceful deception. They preached and ordained, in the city of Písek, to those people who had fled to them on the mountains,³⁰ that all the brethren should pool absolutely everything, and for this purpose the priests set up one or two chests, which the community almost filled up for them.

I suppose Laurence of Březová's statement, that the people "threw their money at the feet of the priests" in the Bechyně region, to refer to these chests in Písek, and perhaps to their prototypes which had presumably been set up on the mountains. In any case, it seems probable that the mountain congregations of the area transferred themselves to Písek.

In connection with the common chests a civil regime took shape, consisting of the priests, various officials, and at the head, the captain Matthew Louda of Chlumčany.³¹ This regime distributed what was in the chests according to individual need,³² and it also seems to have carried out a confiscation of burgage property.³³ The organization of the people into four divisions for fighting and plundering, attested at a somewhat later date,³⁴ may also have existed in the beginning; certainly the plundering did — the masses of uprooted poor people could hardly have supported themselves otherwise. Writing in January or early February, Master Jakoubek of Stříbro complained:³⁵

The people, from your preaching and perilous interpretations of Scripture, are taking up carnal arms, abandoning the usual labor of their hands, and living in idleness from the plundering of their neighbors' substance; they kill and shed blood. . . . Many trustworthy people are complaining about you . . . calling you bloody priests.

The emergence of a new social order at Písek was only a preliminary to an even more remarkable development: the installation of that order in a totally new community. The background of this event is very unclear, although we know that it followed shortly after the predicted coming of Christ, during Carnival, had failed to take place.³⁶ In the early morning of February 21, 1420, "a large number of Taborite brethren and of peasants," with the help of "their brethren within the city," captured Ústí-nad-Lužnicí while the Catholic citizens were still incapacitated from their revels of the night before, Shrove Tuesday.³⁷ We are told that the coup was led by the priest Vanček and the cleric Hromádka, who had one year before organized the first hilltop congregations on Mt. Tabor, in the same general region, and that they had the help of the local priests John of Smolín and John of Bydlín; they also had the help or perhaps even leadership of Lord Procop of Ústí,³⁸ whose anti-Hussite uncle held the city. A few days later these Taborites took possession of the nearby abandoned fortress of Hradiště, on a much stronger site, and they began to move there, renaming it Tabor. Hromádka took the further, decisive step of sending news of his action to Žižka in Plzeň, together with a request for help. Žižka, his position in Plzeň growing more and more unsafe, first sent one of his lieutenants, then came himself, with all the Plzeň Taborites, on March 25. Soon after, on March 30, the town of Ústí was burnt and abandoned.

Since Písek had fallen into royalist hands, perhaps about a week or so before,³⁹ Tabor emerged as *the* chiliast city of the realm, the heir of all the previous congregations and communities, and the main center of attraction for new adherents to the chiliast revolution.⁴⁰ The regime of common chests was set up in the manner described above for Písek,⁴¹ and the people were divided into four military and political divisions.⁴² A series of petty raids and more sizable expeditions smashed feudal power in the whole region, which fell under Tabor's dominion.⁴³ Písek was liberated and at once regained her eminence as a leading Taborite city, rivalling Tabor herself. Indeed, during the whole of 1420 and 1421, Písek and Tabor seem to have polarized the Taborite movement, the former attracting the less fanatical chiliasts and eventually emerging as the center of the Taborite reformation after the chiliast element had been destroyed.⁴⁴

The foundation of the chiliast communities has been seen to have given rise to a new social system, one of communism, and an actively hostile, parasitical relationship to the "outside" world. The inner logic of this development was reconstructed nine years later by the rabidly anti-Taborite Master John Příbram:⁴⁵

The people, thus seduced [by the chiliast summons to leave everything, congregate, and pool their money], saw how they had evidently been deceived and how they had been deprived of their estates. And, seeing that nothing had come or was coming of the things that their prophets had prophesied, and suffering hunger, misery, and want, they began to grumble and complain greatly against the prophets. At this point the false seducers thought up a new lie somehow to console the people, and they said that the whole Christian church was to be reformed in such a way that all the sinners and evil people were to perish completely, and that only God's elect were to remain on the earth—those who had fled to the mountains. And they said that the elect of God would rule in the world for a thousand years with Christ, visibly and tangibly. And they preached that the elect of God who fled to the mountains would themselves possess all the goods of the destroyed evil ones and rule over all their estates and villages. [They would enjoy a superabundance of wealth and would not have to pay dues or rents, or render services.]

Then the seducers, wanting to bring the people to that freedom and somehow to substantiate their lies, began to preach enormous cruelty, unheard-of violence, and injustice to man. They said that now was the time of vengeance, the time of destruction of all sinners and the time of God's wrath . . . in which all the evil and sinful ones were to perish by sudden death, on one day. . . . And when this did not happen and God did not bring about what they had preached, then they themselves knew how to bring it about and again thought up new and most evil cruelties . . . , that all the sinners were to be killed by the afflictions described in *Ecclesiasticus* [xxxix, 35-36]. . . . And again those cruel beasts, the Taborite priests, wanting to excite and work up the people so that they would not shrink from these afflictions, preached . . . that it was no longer the time of mercy but the time of vengeance, so that the people should

strike and kill all sinners. . . . And they called us and others who admonished them to be merciful, damaging hypocrites. . . .

Except for the crude implication of conscious demagoguery, the pictured interplay of material necessity, social fantasy, and violent mass-action seems convincing. What Příbram shows is the passage of the movement from a predominantly or perhaps entirely adventist emphasis, with a fundamentally passive attitude to reality (leave the old world, congregate, and wait, fighting in self-defense), to an aggressive posture vis-a-vis the feudal order, and a new emphasis on the millennium that would succeed the Day of Wrath.⁴⁶ And it is important that all these ideas came to life as the ideology of an actual social organism.

The postulates on which the new, properly chiliast world-view was based are stated in a Latin chiliast tractate that displays all the rigorous articulation of a scholastic *questio*.⁴⁷ The author first states his four suppositions: that *Apocalypse x*, 7 and *Daniel xii*, 7 are true; that the glories of the new era will come only after the completion of Christ's (i. e., of the Christians') sufferings; that "the words of the Old and New Testaments are true as they sound and in the way they are arranged," and that they can be cited as true statements; that "nothing is to be added to or removed from the divine words." He goes on:

On the basis of these suppositions I have formed the position that is the foundation of almost all my preaching. Already now, in consummation of the Age, Christ is coming, on the day that is called the Day of the Lord, in order to prepare the consummation in the conquered House of Exasperation [Ezekiel iii, 9], and in order to renovate the Church and set it as a praise on the earth. He is coming to assume his kingdom in this world, and to purge all scandals from it, as well as all those who do iniquity; nor will he admit anything polluted to it, anything productive of lies or abomination. . . .

The glory of the Church is to be awaited in respect to the following: First that it will be gathered together; second that it will be purified; third that it will be multiplied; fourth, that it will be pacified; fifth, that it will be of greater glory than it has ever been.

Although the author took great pains to make clear his conception of "seculum" as an Age rather than as the world itself, citing various scriptural passages that he thought proved his point (e.g., *Heb. ix*, 26: *Matt. xii*, 32; *Luke xx*, 35), the Prague masters insisted on regarding his interpretation as an "ignorant error," showing a lack of grammatical training.⁴⁸ But understood in the context of the Taborite communities' situation in the winter of 1419-1420, the author's ideas are relevant first principles, not mere speculations of doubtful accuracy. The confrontation of the Taborite congregations and the royalist butchers, with all the good apparently on one side and all the evil on the other, could easily seem like the prelude to the secular conflict awaited by many

late-medieval Europeans — especially the Hussites, of all parties. All the divine promises of redemption (cf. Jeremiah xxxi ff. and *passim*) would be fulfilled in "those who have been collected," and the "consummation of the Age" was simply "the commutation of the good into better and the extermination of the evil."⁴⁹

The passage from this general picture to an actual ideology of violence was effected primarily by the Taborite priest John Čapek, whose tracts—"more full of blood than a fish-pond is of water"—supplied the ideas that "almost all the Taborite priests" preached to "the simple people gathered on the mountains."⁵⁰ Starting with the postulate that "the present time is the Day of Vengeance and punishment," Čapek urged the Taborites to destroy all property, all buildings, all people of higher estate, and indeed all people of any estate who refused to join the Taborites in promoting the chiliast program—"the liberation of every truth, the increase of the praise of God, the securing of human salvation, and the destruction of sins"—in other words, to adhere to the chiliast community. It was a doctrine of unlimited warfare, wholly alien to the scholastic justification of war, which insisted on certain conditions: a just cause, a valid authorization, and an upright intention.⁵¹ Practically, these conditions meant that the sword was normally reserved to the established powers, who were to use it primarily to defend the Church or the Faith; the nature and duration of the fighting would be determined by the aim alone. The Prague masters repeated these principles again and again, but the essentially negative goals of chiliast warfare made anything short of total destruction unsatisfactory, and "legitimate, Christian warfare" was contemptuously rejected in favor of "unchristian war, based on evil and unworthy principles."⁵²

This negativity of chiliast ideology lay behind even the apparently positive ideas that justified Taborite practice. Thus, according to a list of Taborite "articles" compiled in the medieval manner from the Taborite literature and statements of the period,⁵³ the chiliasts thought that Christ had already come secretly, like a thief in the night and was working through them: they were "God's angels sent to lead the good out of their cities and villages . . . onto the mountains," and to "sweep out all scandals and evils from Christ's Kingdom."⁵⁴ They were "an army sent by God through the whole world to inflict all the plagues of vengeance."⁵⁵ They were thus emancipated from all human restraints—the faithful had to plunge their swords into the enemies of Christ's Law and wash their hands in their victims' blood.⁵⁶ This punishment of sinners was "according to the will of the Holy Spirit"⁵⁷ —a very significant formulation, as will be seen. Needless to say, the only emancipation that took place was downwards, and contemporary

observers saw not angels but "insensate beasts, mad dogs, and roaring lions."⁵⁹

The social ideas of the chiliast vision were similarly subject to the contradiction between unchanging human needs and the postulated transformation of human nature that did not come about. The general principle has already been seen: the old *seculum* was being superseded by a new one which would be not just better than the old but wholly different, based on a new relationship between God and man. In this new "renovated" Kingdom, Christ himself would come down to Mt. Tabor from heaven, this time openly and in glory, and entertain his elect at great festivals on the mountains.⁶⁰ All the elect would "have the Holy Spirit fully,"⁶¹ and would hence be purged of all sinfulness; they would be brought to the innocent state of Adam in Paradise. The old sacraments would consequently lose their reason for existence, and would either be dropped or transformed.⁶² The Law of God would be written on men's hearts and there would thus be no need for teaching, books, Bibles, or "worldly wisdom" in general. Indeed, "in that time the New Testament would cease and be annulled in many points." Women, finally would not have to "pay the debt" to their husbands, but would conceive without physical seed and bear children without pain.

Since the fact of original sin was supposed to be ultimately responsible for all the institutions of medieval society and all the characteristics of man's painful life on earth, the elimination of original sin would mean a life of perfect satisfaction:⁶³

Those who will remain alive in that time will be brought to a state of innocence, like Adam and Enoch and Elijah in paradise, and no one will suffer hunger or thirst or have any physical pain or any sorrow, and no one will suffer any vexation.

And since social institutions as such presuppose man's sinful nature, the new society would have no need for them:⁶⁴

In that time there will be no kingship or dominion on the earth, nor any subjection. All rents and dues will cease. No one will compel another to do anything, but all will be equal brothers and sisters.

If then we are told that the chiliasts urged that the people "do not work" but instead destroy the crops,⁶⁵ we can regard this total lack of prudence as the expression of the *true* chiliast attitude to social problems. But the new communities could hardly live by these ideals; as long as there was still a need for food and other necessities, and as long as men were of limited intelligence and morality, there would have to be social institutions. And we have seen that such institutions were set up in the form of common chests and a supervisory corps of officials. Insofar as this system was determined by something else

than simple expediency, as a practical way of distributing scarcity, it must have been inspired not by the chiliast ideal of a perfect condition—which could not really give rise to any practical arrangements—but by the imitation of the apostolic Christianity portrayed in Acts ii, 44-47. In other words, the older sectarian tradition, which had animated the first hilltop congregations of 1419, pointed the way to practical action where chiliiasm could not. At the same time, this communistic arrangement became a Taborite article of faith, along with the properly chiliast doctrines quoted above:⁶⁶

Just as at Tabor there is nothing mine and nothing yours, but everything in the community is possessed equally, so everything should always be in common for all, and no one may have anything privately; if he does, he sins mortally.

Still more practical, if less pleasant, were other ideas circulating alongside the chiliast prophecies: the Taborites would become the lords of the earth, entering into all the property of the evil.⁶⁷ In the sense that these and other contradictory elements all stemmed from the rejection of the existing world, they may be regarded as parts of the same ideology, but it is correspondingly clear that the purely chiliast ideas *cannot* have had their origins as ideas in the social needs of the Taborite masses, however richly these needs nourished the ideas.⁶⁸

* * * * *

In seeking now to determine the true origin of the chiliast world view, we are fortunately able to begin with some fairly explicit statements in the sources. At the beginning of his discussion of Taborite chiliiasm, Laurence of Březová wrote:⁶⁹

The chief author, publicizer, and defender of these doctrines was a certain young priest from Moravia, of elegant wit and with an extraordinarily good memory, whose name was Martin [Húška] and who was called Loquis. . . . His chief helpers were Master John of Jičín, Markold—a bachelor of arts, Koranda, and other priests of Tabor named previously. All of these had much respect for a certain Wenceslas, a tavern-keeper in Prague, who had a surpassingly good knowledge of the Bible, expounding the New Testament by the Old, and vice versa.

Apart from this evidence we have an excellent picture of Martin as a chiliast in Peter Chelčický's report of a long discussion he had had with Martin sometime in late 1420 or in 1421. Chelčický, in the course of a critical tractate addressed to the priests of Tabor, complained:⁷⁰

But Martin was not humble or at all willing to suffer for Christ—even as you are not. And he declared to us his belief that there will be a new Kingdom of the Saints on earth, and that the good will no longer suffer, and he said, "If Christians were always to have to suffer so, I would not want to be a servant of God." That is what he said!

This priceless testimony clearly shows the chasm between the chiliast

and the Waldensian outlooks, as well as the nature of the change that had come about in Chelčický's former associates.

But Martin's name was also associated with another heresy, which came to the surface in 1420 and 1421: the denial of a Real Presence in the Eucharist and the reduction of that sacrament to a commemoration. In Hussite Bohemia this heresy was called "Pikartism"; according to Laurence of Eřezová:⁷¹

The origin and root of this accursed heresy came to the Kingdom of Bohemia from certain Picards, who came to Prague in 1418 with their wives and children, almost forty men, saying that they had been expelled by their prelates on account of the Law of God. And they said that they had come to the realm because they had heard that in Bohemia there was the greatest liberty for the evangelical truth.

The name of "Picard" suggests an origin in northern France, and indeed one source says the group had come from "Gallia Belgica,"⁷² but it has been argued that the name was simply a version of "Beghard."⁷³ In any case these heretics soon showed that their conception of the "evangelical truth" involved the debasement of the very sacrament that the Hussites venerated above all else; but although they alienated most of their former friends in Prague they also made Czech disciples, among whom we may probably number Martin or Martin's teacher—perhaps Wenceslas the tavern-keeper and Bible expert.⁷⁴

It has already been seen that the chiliast doctrine of a New Age implied the abolition of the existing sacraments; the infusion of the Holy Spirit would wipe out sin and hence make the Catholic sacraments unnecessary. Pikartism, in actual fact, was closely related to chiliiasm. An even closer relation, which became known in 1421, was the heresy of the "Adamites," who not only claimed to be already living in the New Age but actually behaved as if they were, indulging their supposedly sinless natures in orgiastic practices that were in no way different from what unregenerated souls did, or longed to do, under the title of lust.⁷⁵ And while Martin does not seem to have preached or practiced Adamitism, his name appears as the Adamites' teacher, at least in the Pikart ideas that they held. At any rate, it is sufficiently clear that chiliiasm, Pikartism, and Adamitism were in fact elements of a *single* thought-structure, capable of taking on one or another emphasis according to the situation or to the disposition of its adherents. What we call chiliiasm was only the full secular development of this complex under favorable political conditions. And if Martin was chiefly responsible for bringing these ideas into the Taborite movement, those who originally introduced the heresy, "in a kind of sudden storm," were "the most faithless Pikarts, immigrants."⁷⁶

At this point, then, the inquiry must direct itself across Europe, to "Gallia Belgica." And indeed this general area provides us with a splendid example of just the kind of heretical complex we have been discussing.⁷⁷ In 1411 the famous Pierre D'Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, presided over an inquisitional process concerned with a Brussels sect known—to its members—as the "Homines intelligencie."⁷⁸ The resulting list of heretical articles emphasizes sex in the first place and in extremely interesting detail: it is clear that the "Homines intelligencie" and the Bohemian Adamites were enjoying pretty much the same thing in the same ways. Another Brussels doctrine, "that God is everywhere—in stores, in men's limbs, even in Hell—just as He is in the sacrament of the altar, and therefore any man has God perfectly even before he takes communion," clearly points to the common basis of both Adamism and eucharistic heresy. But in a subordinate position in the list is still another set of ideas similar in content and even language to the ideas of Taborite chiliasm.⁷⁹ The Brussels articles, however, point clearly to the ultimate *source* of these ideas: the "Joachimite" construction of history in the sectarian form given it by the sects of the "Free Spirit."⁸⁰ Thus we read that "whatever idea came to them or suggested itself, they thought it had come from the Holy Spirit." They believed in the "end of the present law" and the beginning of the "law of the Holy Spirit and of spiritual freedom"—ideas that animated the new Taborite society that has been traced out above. With the Brussels heretics, however, these revolutionary principles could be realized only in individual behavior of a sort consonant with the sect's underground existence. Their sexual liberty was the only positive freedom that the poor could enjoy.⁸¹

Two qualifications, however, must be made in the above account. Although the Prague sources credit the Pikart immigrants of 1418 with introducing the heresy into Bohemia, it is also possible that there were other pathways of Free Spirit influence — particularly through contact with Catharo-Waldensian sects active generally in central Europe, including South Bohemia.⁸² And in any case the Taborite chilasts presented the Free-Spirit ideology in a form determined partly by their unique social situation, partly by their general Hussite background. The former modification needs no further discussion; in regard to the latter it is clear from the sources that the Taborites spoke only of a new advent of *Christ*, the Kingdom of *Christ*, or even the Kingdom of the Father, but never explicitly the Kingdom of the Holy Spirit. But there is no difficulty, since we read that "all in this coming are to have the Holy Spirit fully."⁸³ that "an abundance of the Holy Spirit will come into the hearts of the faithful,"⁸⁴ that the elect "will be baptised in the Holy Spirit."⁸⁵ And Martin, the leading chilast, wrote that "Christ is the Holy Spirit, about whom it is said in the Bible: 'And I shall give you

another comforter'; that is, really himself, but different and spiritual. And so now . . . Christ is giving himself spiritually and he is with us to the end of the world . . ."⁸⁶ It is as though Martin were himself trying to demonstrate the possibility of expressing Free-Spirit doctrine within the conceptual framework of a less radical tradition.

* * * * *

Returning now to the Taborite communities, we can understand their revolutionary significance with precision. If a revolution is defined as the sudden substitution of one social and intellectual world for another, it is clear that Tabor was the first revolutionary society in Europe. The peasant or artisan who abandoned his land or sold his property, who burnt his home and left his friends and family, and who then made his way to chiliast Písek or chiliast Tabor, was truly passing from one world into another, in which neither the first principles nor the practical arrangements of the old order had validity. *In actual fact*, the Joachimite-Free-Spirit vision of the chiliast prophets, who included almost all the Taborite priests in 1420, had set the Taborites free from the feudal order. They could now build their own society.

As soon as they began to do so, however, they inevitably developed counterbalances to the chiliast influence. The standing army could support itself by plunder, and to an extent did so,⁸⁷ but in the long run it had to be based on a more certain socio-economic foundation. Thus alongside the common chests and the plundering raids there was built up a regular seigneurial relationship between Tabor as overlord and the peasants and villages under her sway.⁸⁸ (Eventually the common chests seem to have become simply the means by which Tabor supported her clergy.⁸⁹) A system of crafts was also developed, so that Tabor soon became a "Gewerbestadt," economically similar to most of the royal towns of Bohemia,⁹⁰ except that the old guild monopolies were broken, at least in the beginning.⁹¹ And the priests of Tabor, having done their work of fanatical chiliast preaching, had to turn their attention to the more ordinary aspects of religious practice; in September 1420 they elected a "bishop," Nicholas of Pelhřimov, who was to regulate preaching, supervise the clergy, and administer the common funds "according to the need of each brother."⁹² He also addressed himself to the task of developing a systematic Taborite religion to transcend the negative or impractically perfectionist sectarianism of earlier days.⁹³ A Prague B. A., Nicholas, used his grasp of scholasticism to compose a body of doctrinal literature second to none in Hussite Bohemia.⁹⁴ The religio-social organism that he thus helped to create was the first reformed society in Europe.

Of great help in this general consolidation of Tabor was the renewal of the Prague connection. After Sigismund had had the anti-Hussite crusade openly proclaimed, on March 17, 1420, Prague had to reverse her policy of collaboration.⁹⁵ She summoned all good Czechs to help defend their country, and at the end of May the Taborites set out en masse for the capital. Collaboration in the *national* war, the discipline necessary to allow Taborites and Praguers to live in the same city for several months, and the accommodation of doctrine demanded by the formulation of a common Hussite program—the Four Articles of Prague⁹⁶—all these combined to stabilize the Taborite mind.

By the end of 1420, when the Prague masters read off their list of seventy-two "heretical" articles, including the whole of chiliast doctrine as well as Pikartism, the leading Taborites paid only lip-service to these ideas. Žižka was totally silent, and Nicholas of Pelhřimov, while stating his adherence to the articles of the list—except for "what was venomous in them"—took the first opportunity to shift the discussion to the wholly non-chiliast subject of mass-ritual.⁹⁷ Only Martin Húška among the priests spoke up with any vigor. And two months later Nicholas and the Taborite Master John of Jičín actually denounced Martin and the Pikarts to the Prague masters and asked the latter for help.⁹⁸ Then the Taborite leaders expelled the Pikarts from the city, and the Taborite armies, in cooperation with Prague, slaughtered both Pikarts and Adamites by the hundreds. With the cruel burning of Martin himself, on August 21, 1421, the Free-Spirit phase of Taboritism was officially ended, although chiliast tendencies evidently persisted among some Taborites well into the 1420's. It was not until 1422 and even later that the chiliast doctrine of total war was formally replaced by regulations drawn from Prague's scholastic doctrine,⁹⁹ and the blood-and-thunder Bible-preaching of the chiliast-minded priests was explicitly superseded by the principle that nothing might be preached which contradicted the life and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles.¹⁰⁰

In the mid-twenties a leading Taborite, perhaps Nicholas of Pelhřimov, wrote:¹⁰¹

We do not consider as true that story which some tell, that a good age is coming, in which there will be no evil doers, and that they will not suffer at all but will be filled with ineffable joy.

Thus Martin Húška's moving declaration to Chelčický, that "if Christians were always to have to suffer so, I would not want to be a servant of God," was relegated to the Taborite attic of outmoded ideas. We know, of course, that it was precisely that "story" that had led the radical Hussite masses to give up their old life and join the new

Taborite communities in the winter of 1419-1420. And we know that the chiliast ideology of unlimited war against the old world had transformed south Bohemia from a Catholic hunting-ground into a Hussite bastion, nourishing perhaps the most vital elements of the Bohemian reformation. But it was the heroic virtue of men like Nicholas of Pelhřimov and the other leading Taborite priests that they were able to sense the point at which the beautiful story had exhausted its constructive power, break with their chiliast past, and devote themselves to the much more difficult tasks of hard thinking and political action required to make the Taborite vision work. Here as always in the radical movement, intellectual nourishment was drawn from the Prague University, even while spiritual vitality was provided by the generations-old tradition of popular heresy.

1. The following introduction is based on the author's "Hussite Radicalism and the Origins of Tabor, 1415-1418," *Médiévalia et Humanistica*, X (1956), 102ff, and on an unpublished study of the events of 1419. The general background and sequence of events of the period covered by the present paper can be studied in F. Heymann's *Žižka and the Hussite Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955)—hereafter cited as "Heymann."
2. The sectarian ideas amounted to the rejection of all doctrines and rites not stipulated as necessary by the New Testament. Rejected were, specifically, the cult of saints, holy images, the complexities and lavishness of mass-ritual, the doctrine of Purgatory and the consequent works for the dead, the doctrinal and ecclesiastical authority of the Roman hierarchy, the holding of property or regular reception of income, in any form, by the clergy. The sacramental acts of sinful priests were regarded as invalid.
3. The mountain is not so named in the Bible but only in a tradition dating from the fourth century. Cf. the sermon on Matt. xxviii, 16, preached by the Prague radical John Želivský on 21 April 1419 [ed. A. Molnář, *Jan Želivský. Dochovaná kázání z roku 1419*, I (Prague: Czechoslovakian Academy, 1953), 43]. Aeneas Sylvius, *Historia Bohemica* (Helmstadt: J. Sustermann, 1699), ch. xl, also cites the tradition as the source of Tabor's name. Cf. also Judges iv, 6ff.
4. Master Laurence of Březová, "Husite Chronicle" (in Latin), ed. J. Goll, *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, V (Prague, 1893), 351f. (this work hereafter cited as "Laurence of Březová"). Laurence's chronicle is extremely reliable and is the basic narrative source for the period under discussion.
5. See Heymann, p. 105ff.
6. Laurence of Březová, p. 357 (an entry for January-February 1420).
7. On 10 February 1420 Sigismund named Plzeň, Písek, and Hradec Králové as centers of Wylyfite resistance (*Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkriegs*, I, ed. F. Palacký (Prague: Tempaský, 1873), 15-17). The name of Klatovy, near Plzeň, is added in an anonymous news report (*ibid.*, p. 24). Cf. also the source presented by A. Bernt, "Ein deutsches Hussiten-paternoster aus dem Stifte Hohenfurt," *Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, XXXIX (1901), 320, which names Žatec as a center of resistance. The chiliasts at one point urged people to flee to Žatec, Louny, and Slaný (see note 9 below); these towns may therefore have maintained resistance during the whole period after the November truce.
8. P. 355f. The second paragraph obviously recapitulates and amplifies the first, and may therefore have been a later insertion. Laurence's dating is confirmed beyond reasonable doubt by the fact that the only exactly dated source for the early phase of the chiliast movement, an anti-chiliast letter, was written on 22 January [ed. F. M. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmus r. 1420," *Do čtyř pražských artykulů* (Prague, 1925), p. 97].
9. The idea that five cities would endure through the Day of Wrath was based on Isaiah xix, 18. No chiliast text we know names five Bohemian cities, and we know indeed that at first the cities were not named: the resultant confusion in the minds of the faithful was

noted in a rescript issued by the Prague masters Jakoubek of Stříbro and Christian of Prachatic, probably written sometime in January 1420 (ed. J. Goll, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Böhmisches Brüder*, II (Prague: Otto, 1882), 52-53 (hereafter cited as "Goll"). The naming of the cities, presumably all pro-chiliast, cannot have been in vogue after Plzeň's surrender to the royalists, on 20 March 1420. On the other hand, the omission of Písek, an important Taborite city, suggests that the list had only a secondary significance.

10. Ed. Z. Nejedlý, *Dějiny husitského zpěvu za války husitské* (Prague, 1913), p. 800f. (in Czech). Nejedlý associates it with the early congregations, in the spring and summer of 1419 (p. 198), but only on the basis of content, and in my reconstruction of Taborite history the content fits early 1420 much better.

11. Ed. F. Palacký, *Archiv český*, VI (Prague, 1872), 43f. (in Czech).

12. Jakoubek, writing at about this time, noted that "unus spiritus prophetat, quod rex Babilonis id est rex Ungarie . . . destruct Babilonem id est Pragam" (Goll, II, 58); later, however, the chiliasts preached "quod iam nunc in hoc anno uincioris Pragensis civitas velut Babylon debet destrui et comburi per fideles" (Laurence of Březová, p. 455). Cf. also Master John Příbram's *Zivot kněží táborských* ("The Story of the Taborite Priests"), ed. J. Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci* (Prague: Melantrich, 1951), p. 263 henceforth cited as "Zivot"). In his Czech commentary on the Apocalypse [ed. F. Šimek, *Jakoubek se Stříbra: Výklad na Zjevenie Sv. Jana*, I (Prague, 1932), p. 528], Jakoubek noted that the "blasphemous cry" was raised in Prague: "Flee quickly from Prague—only on the mountains is there salvation and liberation;" elsewhere he accused the Taborite Master John of Jičín of having written to the Praguers, especially to the women, urging them to leave the city (Goll, II, 60). The biblical idea of fleeing Babylon and taking refuge on the mountains was not new to the Bohemian reformers of all parties, but it had previously been understood symbolically.

13. Taken respectively from the rescript of Jakoubek and Christian of Prachatic, Goll, II, 51-53; a letter from Jakoubek to an unnamed non-chiliast priest, Goll, II, 57-59; this letter again; a University rescript of February 17, 1420, ed. F. M. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmus," pp. 97-100. All in Latin.

14. Ed. F. Palacký, *Archiv český*, VI, 41-43 (in Czech); I have emphasized key points.

15. The quote seems to come from Jakoubek's letter, Goll, II, 58.

16. Goll, II, 60; the letter notes that the chiliasts had set a day between February 10 and 14 for the coming Day of Wrath. Master John Příbram compared the Taborite switch from pacifism to violence with the haphazard flight of grasshoppers (*De ritibus missae, apud K. Höfler, Geschichtsschreiber der husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, II, *Fontes rerum Austriae carum*, I. Abt., Bd. VI (1865), 531—hereafter cited as "Höfler").

17. Petr Chelčický, *O boji duchovním*, ed. K. Krofta (Prague: Otto, 1911), p. 27f. See M. Spinka, "Peter Chelčický, the Spiritual Father of the Unitas Fratrum," *Church History*, XII (1943), 271-291; Spinka regards it as almost certain that Chelčický was influenced by the Waldenses (p. 274).

18. See his *O trojím lidu* ("On the Triple Division of Society"), ed. Krofta, *op. cit.*, p. 155ff. and *passim*.

19. The evidence, some of which has already been noted, consists of the letters and rescripts addressed by the Prague masters to those who had asked their advice. The surviving letters were probably all written by Master Jakoubek; they include: (1) a letter to non-chiliast priests in general, January 22, 1420 (ed. F. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmus," p. 97); (2) a letter to an anonymous non-chiliast priest (Goll, II, 57-59); (3) a letter to the chiliast Master John of Jičín (Goll, II, 59-60).

Of the rescripts two survive. In one case two priests, a Nicholas and a Wenceslas, had disputed the points summarized in the text below and had agreed, "before a large number of people" to abide by the decision of the masters Jakoubek of Stříbro and Christian of Prachatic, which decision survives (Goll, II, 51-53). The other rescript, anonymous but dated February 17, 1420, is addressed to a "nobilis Domine, zelator legis Christi precipue" and answers the questions whether the faithful might congregate and whether the "secular estates" might fight for the Hussite cause (ed. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmus," pp. 97-100). On the assumption that the rescripts were addressed to Taborites, scholars have tried to identify Nicholas and Wenceslas and the noble lord; I believe the assumption to be flimsy and the identities of the recipients immovably lodged in obscurity (but cf. Heymann, p. 89). The quotes that follow are drawn chiefly from the first rescript.

20. Goll, II, 52-53.

21. The rescript of February 17, ed. Bartoš, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
22. Of the four chiliast priests named as most prominent by Laurence of Březová, two, Koranda and Markolt, are known to have been in Plzeň (see p. 59 above).
23. *Život*, p. 266. Cf. also p. 275f.
24. *Starí letopisové čeští*, ("Old Czech Annalists"), ed. F. Palacky, *Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum*, III (Prague, 1829), 29-30 (henceforth cited as "OCA").
25. The main body of the local Taborites captured Ústí on February 21, 1420 (see below), and had presumably been expelled some time before that date; a turbulent history of mutual expulsions by the various parties in Ústí is suggested by one source, *OCA*, p. 471f., which is unfortunately telescoped and hence not clear. See Heymann, p. 87.
26. For Písek radicalism in 1416 see J. Macek, *Tábor v husitkém revolučním hnutí*, I (Prague: Czechoslovakian Academy, 1952), 216. Laurence of Březová, p. 347, tells of the destruction of the Dominican monastery there by the Hussites on August 20, 1419. A special study of the "Beginnings of Taboritism in Písek" has been published by J. Macek by *K počátkům táborství v Písku*, *Jihočeský sborník historický*, XX (1953), 113ff.] but is unavailable in this country; some at least of its main contributions are included in Macek's books on Tabor, which I have used and cited.
27. Jakoubek argued that salvation was not to be expected on the basis merely of a man's being in Plzeň or Písek rather than in Prague (Goll, II, 58).
28. See note 7 above.
29. *Život*, p. 264f.
30. This difficult passage reads in the original, "... a tomu zbhémumu lidu k sobě na hory v městě Píseckém kázali a ustavili. . . ."
31. Louda had taken minor orders, studied at the Prague University, and been a notary. In the Hussite revolution, however, he emerged as a political leader [see Macek, *Tábor v husitkém revolučním hnutí*, II (Prague: Czechoslovakian Academy, 1955), 78f]. It has been argued that Louda was with Žižka in Plzeň [F. M. Bartoš, introduction to *Staré letopisy české z Vratislavského rukopisu*, ed. F. Šimek (Prague, 1937), p. vii], but the argument seems to me to be based on too many combinations to be cogent.
32. Although not attested for Písek, this principle governed the administration of the common chests later set up at Tabor: Laurence of Březová, pp. 381, 438.
33. Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 237.
34. *Ibid.*, 145.
35. Goll, II, 60.
36. See above note 16. According to Aeneas Sylvius, *op. cit.*, the day had been fixed at Pentecost. I agree with Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 54, that no great significance is to be attached to such particular dates, which were probably furnished by individual preachers *ad hoc*.
37. Laurence of Březová, p. 357f.; *OCA*, p. 33.
38. *Chronicon veteris collegati Pragensis*, Höfler, I, *FEA*, I. Abt., II (1856), 79.
39. *OCA*, p. 34; cf. Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 76, n. 130.
40. See Laurence of Březová, pp. 358, 370; *Chron. vet. colleg. Prag.*, loc. cit.
41. We know that in the course of 1420 the chests existed in Písek, Tabor, and Vodňany (*Staré letopisy české*, ed. Šimek, p. 28). See also Laurence of Březová, pp. 381, 438.
42. Laurence of Březová, p. 362.
43. Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 136ff., offers by far the best reconstruction and analysis to date of Tabor's wars in south Bohemia and their relation to chiliasm.
44. Both Žižka and the future Taborite Bishop Nicholas of Pělčimov, the two strongest forces leading Tabor towards order and national political action, chose Písek as their base. See Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 238 and *passim*. Macek assimilates the Písek-Tabor polarization to the split between the "bourgeois opposition" (a wholly inaccurate Marxist cliché, meaning in the present context anyone who was interested in property) and "the poor."
45. *Život*, pp. 265-267.
46. A third surviving chiliast letter seems to show this penetration of adventism with the chiliast vision (ed. F. M. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmů," pp. 96-97): . . . the sun will blaze, the clouds will disappear, the darknesses will vanish, blood will flow from wood, and He will reign who is not expected by those living on the earth. . . . Therefore let us be ready. . . . And who is ready? Only he who remains in Christ and Christ in him. And he is in Christ who eats him. But to eat Christ's Body is livingly to believe in him. And to drink his Blood is to shed it with him for his Father. And he takes Christ's Body who disseminates his gifts, and he eats his Body who livingly listens to his Word. . . . And for this eating the just will shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father, when he comes in clouds with his glory and great power, and sends as representatives his glorious angels to sweep out all scandals from his inheritance. And then evil will be abashed, lies will perish, injustice will disappear, every sin will vanish, and faith will

flower, justice will grow, paradise will open to us, benevolence will be multiplied, and perfect love will be abundant. . . .

I write these things to you as to adults, able to eat of all foods, and not as to those living on milk. . . . I admonish you in the name of God to make this letter known to the whole community.

Bartoš dates this letter at the very beginning of the movement, in early January 1420, presumably because of its vagueness. But it is obviously advanced in comparison to the other two letters, and gives a picture of the future Age that none of the early adventist preaching seems to have given. If the letter did originate in January, then it would lead us to interpret even the early adventist preaching as inspired—perhaps at one or more removes—by somebody's clear picture of the millennium.

47. The text has been preserved by Laurence of Březová, pp. 417-424. Only one other Latin chiliasm tractate is known to survive, and it is more diffuse and practical than this one (ed. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliasmus," pp. 102-111).

48. Laurence of Březová, p. 456; K. Krofta, "O některých spisech M. Jana z Příbrama," *Časopis českého Muzea*, LXXIII (1899), 213.

49. Laurence of Březová, p. 418.

50. Život, pp. 268, 289, 282. Like most important Taborite priests, Čapek had a University background. He seems to have been associated with the reform movement even in Hus' time (*Urkundliche Beiträge*, II (1873), 521f.), and he was later reminded by John Příbram that he had held orthodox views on the eucharist in 1417 (*Život*, p. 303). He was a prolific song-writer, and one of the songs definitely his ("Ve jméno boží počněme," c.1417, ed. Nejedlý, *op. cit.*, p. 805ff.) shows a spirit and body of thought very much like Jakoubek's—limiting the cult of saints, for example, but not demanding its abolition; etc. It is instructive to note how the chiliasm fever could take possession of such a man.

51. Život, pp. 268-270.

52. These conditions appear in Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, II, ii, 40, and in Wyclif's *De civili dominio*, ed. Loserth, II (London, 1900), p. 240ff. N. Jastrebov, *Etudy o Petře Chelčickom i jeho vremeni* (St. Petersburg, 1908), p. 92ff., shows, with parallel citations, that the masters were following Wyclif. On the general subject of Hussite attitudes to war, particularly in the tractates and discussions of early 1420, cf. K. Hoč, "Husité a válka," *Česká mysl*, VIII (1907), 131ff., and Jastrebov, *op. cit.*, p. 33ff.

53. *Život*, p. 267.

54. The list is of the greatest importance, since it preserves Taborite ideas not otherwise attested by the sources; its authenticity is proven by the following facts: (1) the articles seem to preserve the Taborite formulations of the original texts, (2) many of the articles are to be found in surviving Taborite sources, and these in no case contradict the articles of the list, (3) the Taborite leaders themselves accepted one version of the list as substantially true, although venomously formulated in some cases (Laurence of Březová, p. 462f.). The surviving texts may be grouped as follows:

I. 1. A Czech version, ed. Palacký, *Archiv český*, III (1844), 218ff., and ed., with corrections, by J. Macek, *Ktož jsá boží bojovníci*, pp. 57-66 (I cite from Macek). The MS was part of the Třebon archives of the Rožmberk family, Tabor's neighbors and greatest enemies in South Bohemia.

2. A Latin version used by Laurence of Březová, pp. 403-405, 413-416, in a systematic discussion of Tabor inserted into the course of his chronicle *ad Augustum* 1420.

II. A Latin version read by the Prague masters at a discussion with the Taborites, in Prague, December 10, 1420 (Laurence of Březová, pp. 453-462).

III. A Latin version given by John Příbram in his *Contra errores Picardorum* [cf. F. M. Bartoš' catalogue of Příbram's works, *Literární činnost M. Jana Rokycany, M. Jana Příbrama, M. Petra Payna* (Prague: Czech Academy, 1928), p. 64, No. 5]. It has been published by (1) J. Döllinger, *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters*, II (Munich, 1890), 691-700, and (2) F. Prochazka, *Miscellaneous der Böhmische und Mährische Litteratur* (Prague, 1784), 279-293.

IV. A Czech version, evidently based on II (*via* III) but very much reworked and adding important historical and circumstantial information, in John Příbram's *Život*, p. 263ff.

Text III differs from II mainly in the arrangement of the articles; there are also some additions. I, 2 seems to be a reworking of I, 1 (or its equivalent). Thus there are basically two redactions known, I, 1 and II; of these II is obviously further away from the original Taborite sources, although possibly preserving a few elements of them not in I, 1. The purpose of I, 1 seems to have simply been to collect the articles; the purpose of II was to make clear their heretical meaning: the articles of II, as opposed to I, 1, are systematized, arranged in logical sequence, and stripped of cir-

cumstantial elements. See note 62 below.

All of the lists contain both chiliast and non-chiliast articles, the latter for the most part Waldensianist. This fact has led some scholars to regard the chiliast and Waldensianist complexes as related. Since the Waldensianist articles are attested as radical beliefs as early as 1415—and notably in the very south Bohemian area where chiliastism flourished and Tabor was founded—it has been supposed that chiliast ideas also were in vogue at that date. Thus, e.g., Heymann, p. 59, in a discussion of pre-1419 radicalism, says that "they were chiliasts." And J. Macek, who regards all the sectarian articles as part of the ideology of "the poor," expressing the poor's social aspirations and attitudes to the feudal order, does not attempt to separate out the varying parts of this ideology (cf. e.g. *Tábor* . . ., II, 89ff.). Against these loose treatments it must be insisted that the Waldensianist and chiliast complexes were distinct, even though co-existing in 1420 among the Taborites and, undoubtedly, in the minds of many individual Taborites. My arguments are as follows:

1. The datable sources show Waldensianist ideas among the provincial radicals as early as 1415 and up through 1418, but they do not speak of chiliastism before January 1420.

2. The Waldensianist and chiliast complexes, although alike in expressing the sectarian mind, stemmed from different orientations of that mind. See for example Chelčický's striking criticism of Martin Húška, p. 30 below. Or compare the following articles, both from the list in question:

[Waldensianist:]

Christians should not hold or believe anything that is not explicitly stated and written in the Bible.

[Chiliast:]

In that time [of Christ's Kingdom] . . . no one will teach anything to anyone, nor will there be any need of books or Bibles, for the Law of God will be written in the heart of everyone. . . . Other equally striking contradictions could be given.

3. Laurence of Březová, who did not simply give the list but used it to compose a picture of Tabor in 1420, separated the two complexes.

My reconstruction, based on the above and other evidence, is this: The basic and original *sectarian* inspiration (there were other inspirations too) of Hussite radicalism and Taborism was Waldensianism, the ideas and attitudes of which entered the Hussite movement in 1415, if not earlier, and fused with the scholastic mind, formed

the basis of Taborite religion throughout Tabor's separate history—i.e., until 1452. For a brief time, however, the Free Spirit complex of chiliiasm (see below) surged to the fore and dominated the Taborite movement, politically and doctrinally, until the latter part of 1420, when representatives of the Waldensianist-scholastic fusion progressively liberated themselves and the Taborites from Free-Spirit ideas. The latter, losing their political scope, took on more and more narrowly sectarian forms, specifically Pikartism and Adamitism (see below), the adherents of which were driven out of Tabor and exterminated in the course of 1421. By the time the Prague masters read their list, on December 10, 1420, the chiliasts had been, so to speak, bypassed as influences on the development of the Taborite organism; although no Taborites disowned the chiliast or Pikart articles of the list at the meeting, no Taborite defense of them was ever offered, and their foremost exponent, Martin Húška (see below) was almost at once imprisoned by one of Tabor's allies.

55. Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, pp. 58-60.
56. Laurence of Březová, p. 455.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 454; Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, p. 58. It is important that these bloodthirsty doctrines also appear in a chiliast source, the Latin tractate published by Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliastmu," p. 111: "the just . . . will now rejoice, seeing vengeance and washing their hands in the blood of the sinners."
58. *Apud Nejedlý*, *op. cit.*, p. 183 n.40.
59. Laurence of Březová, p. 424.
60. J. Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, p. 60. Cf. Jakoubek of Stříbro, *Výklad*, ed. Šimek, p. lxxxvii. The chiliasts thought that Christ had already come secretly.
61. Jakoubek, *Výklad* ed. Šimek, p. 527.
62. The chiliast tractate in Latin ed. Bartoš, "Z dějin chiliastmu," p. 110f., explains that at least some of the sacraments, especially the eucharist, will remain, but in a new form, as memorials of Christ's victory rather than his passion. The author is not sure about the others because "even now certain ones are not kept"—an evident reference to the basic Waldensianism of the Taborite movement. The Czech redaction of the list of Taborite articles, Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, p. 61, makes exactly the same point, but explains more precisely that the need for the old sacraments will not exist because there will be no sin in the New Age. But the Prague text, in Laurence of Březová, p. 460, says only that the Taborites believed the sacraments would not last until Christ's final

coming. It is obvious that this text was formulated *ad usum inquisitionis*.

63. Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, p. 60.

64. *Ibid.*, p. 61.

65. *OCA*, p. 478. Macek, *Tábor* . . ., II, 62 supposes that only work for the lords was to be stopped, but on p. 367 he interprets the source literally, evidently oblivious of his earlier improvement on it.

66. Macek, *Ktož jsú boží bojovníci*, p. 59.

67. See Příbram's testimony, above, p. 55. Cf. Laurence of Březová, p. 423f. And cf. J. Pekář, *Žižka a jeho doba*, I (Prague: Vesmír, 1927), 181f.

68. This is the main weakness that I find in J. Macek's Marxist interpretation, *Tábor* . . ., II. Without in the least denying the correlation between the point of view of the medieval "poor" and chiliast ideology, I feel that the proper use of this insight is as a means of analysis and understanding, not as an *a priori* determination of essence. For the rest, much of Macek's brilliant work can be wholly accepted, but in reverse: for example, chiliiasm was certainly not atheistic, as he says (p. 118), but Marxism may well be called chiliastic; thus the effort to interpret chiliiasm as a kind of forerunner of Marxism can lead to valid judgments.

69. P. 413. Markold and Koranda were among the Plzeň Taborites; John of Jičín was probably active in south Bohemia, perhaps at Písek (cf. *OCA*, p. 471f.). Martin's pre-eminence is attested by Příbram, *Život*, pp. 290, 294.

70. *Apud* Macek, *Tábor* . . ., II, 73.

71. P. 431.

72. Aeneas Sylvius, *Historia Bohemica*, ch. xli.

73. Cf. R. Holinka, "Počátky táborského pikartství," *Bratislava*, VI (1932), 191.

74. Laurence tells of the Czech disciples, p. 431; cf. p. 494 for the later strength of Pikartism in Prague.

75. Laurence of Březová, pp. 517-519 (a letter from Žižka to Prague, describing Adamite practices). Cf. *OCA*, p. 476ff.; Aeneas Sylvius, *op. cit.*

76. J. Příbram, *Contra errores Picardorum, apud* K. Krofta, "O některých spisech M. Jana Příbrama," *Časopis českého Muzea*, LXXIII (1899), 212.

77. The relationship of heresy in north France and Belgium to Hussite Bohemia has been brilliantly explored by F. M. Bartoš, "Picardi a Pikarti," *Časopis českého Muzea*, CI (1927), 225-250. He concludes (pp. 227, 229) that the Picards of 1418 had come from Lille and Tournai, fleeing an inquisition of that year.

78. The record of the process is published in P. Fredericq, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Netherlandicæ*, I (Ghent: J. Vuylsteke, 1889) 269ff.

79. The comparison has been made by R. Holinka, *Sektářství v Čechách před revolucí husitskou, Sborník Filosofické Fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě*, VI (1929), 169-170. He infers not a direct derivation (see note 77 above) but an absolute agreement in substance. I add only a few points to Holinka's work, and the numbering is mine:

[*Homines intelligencie*, Fredericq, pp. 272, 274, 276, 277:]

Item dicunt (1) tempus veteris legis fuisse tempus Patris et tempus novae legis tempus Filii, et primum esse tempus Spiritus Sancti, quod dicunt esse tempus Heliae, (2) quo removebuntur [another version has "reconciliabuntur"] scripturae; (3) ut quae prius tamquam vera habebantur, jam refutentur, etiam et catholicae veritates quae consueverant praedicare de paupertate, continentia, obedientia. Quarum veritatum oppositum, ut asserunt, est predicatum hoc tempore Spiritus Sancti . . . [dicunt] (4) quod praedicationes et doctrinae antiquorum sanctorum et doctrinæ cessabunt et supervenient novae, et (5) quod scriptura clarius revelabitur quam heusque notificata sit, et (6) quod spiritus sanctus clarius illuminabit intellectum humanum quam huiusque fecerit, (7) etiam in apostolis, quia non habuerunt nisi corticem, et (8) quod instabit tempus, quo revelanda erit illa lex spiritus sancti et libertatis spiritualis et (9) tune praesens lex cessabit . . .

[Chiliast articles, Prague text, in Laurence of Březová:]

(1) quod iam nunc ecclesia militans longe ante adventum Christi novissimum . . . per alium adventum Christi, qui iam factus est, in regnum dei . . . reparabit et reparatur . . .; [post] finem et terminum presentis temporis seu anni presentis . . . erit aliud seculum . . . [p. 456]. (2) Quod lex dei scripta in regno reparato ecclesie militantis cessabit et biblie scripta destruantur . . . [p. 458]. [For the variant of (2) above, "reconciliabuntur," cf. Laurence of Březová, p. 413: a certain chiliast layman in Prague "novum per antiquum et e converso exponebat testamentum."] (3) Quod iam . . . Christus in sua mititate, mansuetudine et miseratione adversariis legis Christi exhibenda non est imitandus et sequendus, sed solum in zelo, furore, crudelitate et iusta retribuzione [p. 454]. [Cf. the more precise cor-

respondence of the formulation in Příbram's *Zivot*, p. 276: the chiliasts preached that the Bible would be voided "in regard to suffering, coercion, and subjection to kings and lords." [4] *Quod . . . doctrine sanctorum doctorum . . . ab ecclesia primitiva approbatorum . . . non sunt a fidelibus legende* [p. 460f.]. (5) *Lex Christi omnibus superscribetur in cordibus eorum . . .* [p. 458]. (6) *Quod . . . sol humane intelligentie non lucebit hominibus . . . sed omnes erunt docibles dei* [p. 457]. (7) *Quod gloria huius regni reparati . . . erit maior quam fuit ecclesie primitive* [p. 457]. (8) [Cf. the text cited *ad* (1).] (9) *Quod lex gracie . . . cessabit* [p. 458].

(It will be noted, by the way, that Brussels article 3 suggests a prior Waldensian orientation of the sect.)

80. I follow Holinka, *Sektářství*, p. 171, in regarding the Brussels sect's fusion of Joachimite and Free-Spirit motifs as also the essential characteristic of chiliiasm. (But cf. Heymann, pp. 210ff., 258ff.: the chiliast element seems to be ignored.) On Joachim of Floris and the (Pseudo-) Joachimite tradition, see H. Grundmann, *Studien über Joachim von Floris, Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, XXXII (Leipzig: Teubner, 1927). For the Joachimism of the Brussels sect, see p. 182 n.l. In characterizing Taborite chiliiasm as basically the same as the Brussels heresy I am guided by Grundmann's formulation, p. 115: "... treffen wir hier den Knoten des Ganzens: dass eine solche Zeit als Weltzeit kommen wird, in der das wirklich sein wird, was dem katholischen Christentum stets transzendenten Ideal war, das ist das schlechthinn Unkatholische der joachimischen Lehre, und von da aus geht alle Heterodoxie; nicht von irgendeiner Abweichung in der Dogmenlehre, nicht von einer Kritik der kirchlichen Stände, nicht von einer ablehnung der Sakramentskirche."

81. There were certain *negative* liberties: e.g., the leader of the sect walked naked through the streets one day. It is interesting that the Bohemian Adamites also practiced nudism.

82. So J. Sedlák, *Toborské traktáty eucharistické* (Brno, 1918), introduction, and Holinka, "Počátky táborškého pikartství," p. 195. There is indeed one explicit statement that ideas of the chiliast movement were derived from 14th century German heretics active around Jindřichův Hradec (Neuhaus) in south Bohemia: *Staré letopisy české*, ed. Šimek, p. 29. This area was in fact a seat of popu-

lar Waldensianism [cf. V. Chaloupecký, "K dějinám Valdenského v Čechách před hnutím husitským," *Český časopis historický*, XXXI (1925), 376]. And various central European Waldensian groups at this time did actually cultivate millenarian expectations (see the text in Döllinger, *op. cit.*, II, 363f.). Even the occasional physical violence of some of these groups may help explain the passage from Waldensianism to chiliiasm at Tabor: cf. W. Preger, "Ueber das Verhältnis der Taboriten zu den Waldensern des 14. Jahrhunderts," *Abhandlungen der königliche Bayrische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Hist. Cl., XVIII (1889), 100f; and cf. Döllinger, *op. cit.*, II, 305.

83. Jakoubek, *Výklad*, ed. Šimek, p. 527.

84. *Staré letopisy české*, ed. Šimek, p. 28.

85. Laurence of Březová, p. 416.

86. *Zivot*, p. 291.

87. The division of booty is attested by, e.g., Laurence of Březová, p. 381 ("... unicuique, prout opus erat de spoliis inperciendo . . ."). Strict chiliast doctrine would demand the total destruction of all property, and this was often done after military victories. But there were innumerable petty raids that drew on local peasants, etc. for food and drink; the confessions tortured from those raiders captured by the Rožemberks are preserved in the *Popravčí Kníba pána z Rožemberka*, ed. F. Mareš (Prague, 1878).

88. Laurence of Březová's chronicle contains a note, p. 438, to the effect that although the chiliasts had preached in the summer that all seigneurial dues would cease, Tabor nevertheless collected the usual dues from "her" peasants on St. Gall's Day (October 14) 1420, the regular day of collection. J. Macek, *Tábor . . .*, II, 295-298, argues that the villages later to be parts of Tabor's domains were demonstrably under rule of other lords through 1420 and in some cases later; therefore Tabor cannot have collected from them. But the argument seems to me mechanical: a Taborite force could easily have received collections from a village that also had to pay to another lord. We know that such cases did exist; a Taborite synod of 1422 decreed that exactions should be avoided "... ubi villani fideles veritati adhaerentes coguntur parti adversae censum solvere . . ." (Höfler, II, 485)—the context makes it plain that this practice had gone on. Cf. also Příbram's testimony, *Zivot*, p. 266, that the peasants were paying five or six rents under Tabor.

89. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini visited Tabor in 1451 and described the sys-

tem in a letter to Cardinal Carvajal [ed. R. Wolkan, *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, II. Abt., LXVIII (1918), 25].

90. Macek, *Tábor* . . . , I, 345ff.

91. Cf. Macek, *Tábor* . . . , II, 77 (re the Taborite city of Vodňany). Tabor was a new settlement and had no monopolies to begin with.

92. Laurence of Březová, p. 438.

93. Of Free-Spirit ideas only Pikart eucharistic doctrine left its mark on later Taborite doctrine, which however did not deny a kind of Real Presence—in the form of an infusion of Grace as the worthy communicant took the sacrament.

94. His greatest work was the *Chronicon causam sacerdotum Taboriensium continens*, Höfler, II, 475-820, a majestic collection of tractates and other works, many of them Nicholas' own, arranged to document the Prague-Tabor disputations that lasted from 1420 to 1444.

95. See Heymann, p. 105ff.

96. The draft was produced by discussions of all the Hussites in Prague on March 27, 1420, but the first three had already been proclaimed a month before by Prague and the Hussite barons. Thus the provincial radicals were in effect adhering to the Prague program and putting their own into the background. Very briefly, the Four Articles demanded: (1) free preaching of the Word of God, (2) ultraquist communion, (3) the removal of civil ownership or dominion from the clergy, (4) the punishment of all public mortal sins. See F. M. Bartoš, "Vzámk pražských artikulů," *Do čtyř pražských artikulů* (Prague, 1925), pp. 70-73: even the last article may have preceded the May meetings.

97. See Heymann's account, p. 192ff. What the Prague masters wanted primarily was to force the argument of chiliast ideas before the University community, the latter being the supreme Hussite arbiter of doctrine. Cf. Jakoubek's request that John of Jičín do just that, in January 1420, Goll, II, 60.

98. Laurence of Březová, p. 474f.

99. Höfler, II, 482ff; cf. Hoch, *op. cit.*, p. 377, Jastrebov, *op. cit.*, p. 103ff.

100. Höfler, II, 482ff.

101. *Apud* Macek, *Tábor* . . . , II, 354.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"Church and State in Republican China. A Survey History of the Relations between the Christian Church and the Chinese Government, 1911-1945." By Arne B. Sovik (17 Rte. de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland). Yale University, 1952. Director: K. S. Latourette.

The Ming Empire had admitted Roman Catholic Christianity into China with some hesitation. After a period of tentative tolerance the Manchus forbade the propagation of the faith for two reasons: first, it feared the Church as the vanguard of Western aggression; second, the alien ideology of the Church was a threat to the Confucian pattern of society and government. In the nineteenth century Christian missions countered the attack of the Empire by entering under the protection of a system of treaty rights forced upon China by the Western powers. The churches were therefore in a state of irreconcilable conflict, sometimes overt, sometimes latent, with the Empire.

This is the background for the period discussed in this dissertation. The Republican period saw the gradual elimination of the major causes of tension between church and government and the growth of friendly relations.

When the Empire crumbled and the Confucian pattern was disregarded, one of the nascent Republic's first acts was to declare full religious freedom. This was the first step in effecting a reconciliation. Through the years the concept of religious liberty gained strength. But at the same time the growth of popular secularism and nationalism led to the establishment of a government which, while insisting that it was not religious, assumed some of the prerogatives of religion and threatened the freedom of action of the church (in education, for example).

Meanwhile the way was opened for

the church to sever its relations with foreign powers, whose protection was theoretically unnecessary and was practically an increasing embarrassment. This severance of relations was finally accomplished in 1943, with the abrogation of the "unequal treaties." It came about not so much through the efforts of the church as through changes in international politics and through the pressure of China's new nationalism.

The process of reconciliation between church and state was complicated by many factors, among them the ancient resentments, foreign missionary dominance in the church—which linked it with foreign imperialism, the tumultuous times, and the tendency toward secular totalitarianism in the Kuomintang. Reconciliation was fostered by such factors as the presence in government of many men of Christian faith or ideals, the evident concern of the Christians for China's welfare, the growing strength of Chinese leadership in the church, common concern over the problem of Communism, and the weakness of the totalitarian factor in the Kuomintang Government.

In 1945, when this study ends, the churches and the Government were in friendly if somewhat ambiguous relations. Two dangers threatened: the discrimination of the Kuomintang Government and the rise of Communist power.

"Methodist Theology in Great Britain in the Nineteenth Century, with Special Reference to the Theology of Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, and William Burt Pope." By Elden Dale Dunlap (Southwestern College, Winfield, Kan.). Yale University, 1956. Directors: Raymond P. Morris, Albert C. Outler.

Problem: An analysis and interpretation of the main strands and deter-

minative concerns of the Methodist theological tradition as it developed in Great Britain during the nineteenth century, particularly as it is found in the thought of Adam Clarke, Richard Watson, and William Burt Pope.

Findings: (1) The basic Wesleyan theological tradition has as its central concern a soteriology which is completely gracious and Christo-centric. Through prevenient grace, administered by the Holy Spirit, sinful man is enabled to respond freely and responsibly to the saving grace of God in the vicarious and substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ. The end of God's redemptive activity is man's perfection, which is participation in an inter-personal and existential union of the believer with Christ effected through the gracious agency of the Holy Spirit. Since sin, repentance, justification, regeneration, sanctification, and perfection are all relational rather than substantial, salvation is to be experienced by man through the grace of God working through the Holy Spirit in this life.

(2) During the half-century following the death of John Wesley the motifs recounted above remained substantially intact, although the spirit became increasingly scholastic. The crucial Wesleyan doctrine of prevenient grace tended to give way to a stress on co-operant grace, and there was a subtle shift from divine grace and initiative to human agency and role in the economy of salvation.

(3) In the last half of the century W. B. Pope developed the key Wesleyan soteriological doctrines of divine grace and the work of the Holy Spirit more clearly than anyone since Wesley. He "rediscovered" prevenient grace as the crucial relationship of divine initiative and human agency in salvation, and made it clear that the grace of the Atonement underlies both the mediatorial ministry and the Spirit's administration of redemption.

(4) Although Dr. Pope's efforts left Methodism at the end of the century in possession of a theological heritage that was substantially true to

John Wesley—and more clearly and systematically enunciated than it had ever been, there was clear evidence that the liberal ferment of the century was beginning to work within the Connexion, particularly during the last quarter of the century.

"Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France, 1555-1563." By Robert M. Kingdon (University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts). Columbia University, 1955. Director: Garrett Mattingly.

This dissertation attempts to make more precise our knowledge of the role of the Geneva Company of Pastors, with John Calvin as its Moderator, in directing the activities of missionaries sent from Geneva to France in the years just preceding the outbreak of the French religious wars, 1555-1563. It consists of an analysis of the background, training, examination, placement, and continuing discipline of eighty-eight of these missionaries, plus a narrative of those political activities of the ecclesiastical organization thus formed for which the Geneva Company bears some responsibility.

The eighty-eight missionaries had come to Geneva from nearly every province in France. Many of the leaders among them were of noble birth; the majority of them were probably of middle-class origin. At the University of Geneva or at the Lausanne Academy most of them had been trained in Biblical languages, in knowledge and exegesis of Biblical texts, and in Calvinist theology. They had been examined as to their competence, orthodoxy, and ability to express the basic Calvinist doctrines. Finally they had been accredited, secretly led into France, and placed in pulpits that had been selected for them, on the basis of requests sent to Geneva from local congregations. Even in the pulpit they were not permitted entire independence of thought and action. Local consistories, regional colloquies, provincial and national synods were quickly formed,

and they, with the pastors of Geneva, watched over the missionaries to make sure that they maintained their skill and orthodoxy and that they cooperated with the general ecclesiastical organization.

The policies that the Geneva Company of Pastors instructed the Reformed ministers in France to follow varied over the years. At first these men were told to keep all Protestant activity secret and to seek support from certain powerful noblemen. Some of them were tempted to exceed the general advice from Geneva by joining in conspiracies for the sake of establishing Protestantism in France, a lure to which even a few of the Geneva leaders responded. When royal oppression was relaxed somewhat in 1561, the pastors immediately began, with Geneva's full approval, the most active campaign of public Protestant evangelism France has ever seen, centering their activities in certain big cities and in provinces controlled by members of the high nobility who were sympathetic to Protestantism. A flood of books from Geneva helped the pastors in this phase of their evangelical campaign. Finally, when Catholic repression threatened to destroy their work, the pastors joined ranks with the Huguenot noblemen led by Condé and persuaded their congregations to devote men, money, and munitions to religious war. The city of Geneva set an example for these militant missionaries by negotiating loans, assisting the passage of mercenaries bound to France, and contributing armament to the forces battling for Protestantism, under the cloak of official neutrality.

The Geneva Company of Pastors was clearly able to maintain rather firm control over the thought and the ecclesiastical organization of French Protestants. This, in itself, caused political trouble, though the Geneva pastors tried, with considerable success, to adapt their policies to the practical demands of the political situation in France. They were least successful in controlling the political and military activities of Calvinist no-

biemen, and many of the setbacks to their policy were due to the activities of Huguenot leaders acting against ministerial advice.

This study thus supplies new information, gained largely by research in Swiss archives, on the problems of the politics of early French Calvinists posed by Nürnberger, on the nature of their pastorate as analyzed by Heyer, and on the history of their activities as narrated by Imbart de la Tour, Romier, and others. It was published in 1956, with revisions but under the same title, by the Librairie E. Droz of Geneva, Switzerland.

"Samuel Harris, American Scholar."
By Frederick W. Whittaker (Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine). Yale University, 1950. Director: Luther A. Weigle.

Samuel Harris (1814-1899) of East Machias, Maine, was educated at Bowdoin College and Andover Seminary. He served pastorates in Conway and Pittsfield, Mass. For twelve years he was Professor of Systematic Theology at Bangor Theological Seminary, and for four years President of Bowdoin College. His active career was closed by a term of twenty-five years as Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology at Yale. He was widely known as a preacher, orator, lecturer, and teacher of theology. He published numerous articles, sermons, and lectures, dealing not only with theological themes but with such subjects as church polity, education, slavery, labor problems, science, and politics. A book of lectures, *The Kingdom of Christ on Earth*, sets forth one of the central tenets of his faith. His first major work, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism*, was published when he was sixty-nine; it is an examination of the personality of man to ascertain his capacity to know and serve God, and a vindication of theism against materialistic philosophies. It was followed by a volume of doctrinal theology, *The Self-Revelation of God*,

which defines the revelation of God in nature, man, and Christ. Harris began to publish his systematic theology at the age of eighty-two; two volumes, *God The Creator and Lord of All*, were printed, and an unpublished manuscript, "God Our Saviour," outlining his doctrine of redemption, completes his work.

This dissertation attempts to fill a gap in the writing of American Church History by presenting for the first time a comprehensive biography of Harris, an exposition of his writings, and a modern appraisal of his contribution to American theology. Harris' writing is distinguished by its manifestation of an unusually wide knowledge of both ancient and contemporary authors. His theology is founded upon a philosophical realism exalting "Reason." He presents a doctrine of man which is realistically optimistic,

emphasizing man's sinfulness and need for redemption as well as his "free will" and ability to cooperate with God for the establishment of His kingdom on earth. A strong evangelical note permeates Harris' words; God is both immanent and transcendent, and takes the initiative in reconciling man to himself by his atoning action in the person of Jesus Christ. He teaches a practical theology, with strong ethical overtones, centering in the demands of the law: "Love God and love thy neighbor as thyself." Harris is one of the earliest proponents of the "social Gospel." He belongs to no school, but combines orthodoxy, modernity, evangelism, and liberalism; he is a "mediating" and "transitional" figure in the development of American theology, and he speaks to the twentieth century as well as his own.

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

December 26, 1956

President Quirinus Breen called the Council to order at the Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri, with R. T. Handy, G. S. Klett, S. E. Mead, J. H. Nichols, F. A. Norwood, L. J. Trinterud, H. S. Smith, and G. H. Williams present. The minutes were approved as printed, and the treasurer's report was received. R. T. Handy and E. G. Schwiebert were appointed auditors for the treasurer's books and were instructed to report at the annual meeting of the Society. A motion of appreciation was voted to the University of Oregon for the assistance given the president of the Society.

J. H. Nichols reported for the editors of *Church History*. A discussion of the various aspects of the publication led to agreement that all parts should be retained as at present. A motion was passed to the effect that the editors should approach certain Continental book sellers and distributors, with a view to increasing European knowledge and use of the journal. Authorization was given to offer a discount of thirty-three and one-third per cent for such service.

L. J. Trinterud reported for the special committee on a project in American Church history. After discussion it was voted that, although the Society should favor and support such projects, it should not enter into the solicitation of funds or administration. The special committee was continued and instructed to investigate further possibilities for carrying on a major project in American church history, to be centered in some institution possessing the requisite resources.

It was voted that the Society accept the proposal of University Microfilms for the microfilming of back files of the journal, and that the editors and treasurer should work with this agency in matters of detail.

Q. Breen announced that a session

on church history has been made a part of the program of the Pacific Coast Section of the American Historical Association.

The deaths of the following members were reported: Prof. Edwin E. Aubrey, Rev. Earl M. Wilbur, Prof. Alexander C. Zabriskie. The following resignations were received: William M. Cross, Robert W. Goodloe, Ralph Greenlow, Alan Hasson, Peter C. Hodgson.

For failure to comply with the constitutional requirements the following were dropped from membership: Julius Briller, Alan W. Carlsten, Richard P. Coombs, Douglas G. Eadie, Edward L. Fortney, George F. Hall, Vasile Hategan, Mrs. Milford F. Henkel, II, Kenneth L. Holmes, Robert Holtheimer, Harold McGee, F. W. Mattox, John Neth, Jr., Orval D. Peterson, Henry Poettcker, James H. Pollard, Mar Eshai Shimun, Cyril C. Simkins, Donovan E. Smucker, Wilbur T. Wallace, Edward B. Welsh, H. F. Werling, Paul D. Whittle, Jr.

The following persons were elected members of the Society, subject to the usual constitutional provision: William J. Bowsma, Allen D. Breck, Richard H. Campbell, William Carleton, Herbert Catlin, James E. Cheek, Horton Davies, Kenneth L. Crose, Glanville Downey, John T. Ellis, Wesley C. Ewert, Robert L. Ferm, William R. Hutchinson, George B. King, Hector Lazos, Elliott J. Mason, William A. Olsen, M. E. Van Antwerp, Arthur P. Kautz, George E. Shankel, Ian Rennie, Cornelius J. Dyck, George E. McCracken, Herbert B. Huffmon, Leonard A. Rust, Donald K. Welsh, Kenneth McCall, and Gregory T. Armstrong.

The Council adjourned after further discussion.

Attest:

F. A. Norwood, assistant secretary.

MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY

December 27, 1956

The meeting of the Society was called to order by President Quirinus Breen in the Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Missouri. The minutes were approved as printed.

The treasurer's report was received, the auditors reported the books in order, and the report was then accepted.

The assistant secretary reported the actions of the Council.

A letter was presented from Timothy L. Smith, winner of the last Brewer Prize, announcing the forthcoming publication of his essay by Abingdon Press, under the title *Revivalism and Social Reform in Mid-nineteenth Century America*. The members of the Society were reminded of the announcement of a Brewer Prize for 1957, to be awarded at the annual meeting of that year. Manuscripts are to be submitted by September 15, 1957. The Society voted that the annual meeting for 1957 should be held concurrently with the American Historical Association.

The nominations of the nominating committee were presented, and the following persons were elected: President H. Shelton Smith; Vice-president, George H. Williams; Secretary, Winthrop S. Hudson; Assistant Secretary, Robert S. Michaelsen; Treasurer, Guy S. Klett; Editors, James H. Nichols and Frederick A. Norwood; other members of the Council, Sanford Fleming, Sidney E. Mead, Carl E. Schneider, Leonard J. Trinterud, Quirinus Breen, Robert T. Handy, Jerald C. Brauer, Harold Grimm.

Editorial Board of *Church History*: J. H. Nichols and F. A. Norwood, with the cooperation of R. H. Bainton, R.

Pierce Beaver, John Dillenberger, E. A. Dowey, Jr., R. M. Grant, W. S. Hudson, S. E. Mead, Wilhelm Pauck, R. C. Petry, and Matthew Spinka.

Membership Committee: L. J. Trinterud, chairman; L. A. Loetscher, S. E. Mead, R. M. Cameron, W. R. Cannon, S. E. Ahlstrom, J. R. von Rohr.

Investment of Endowment Funds: Guy S. Klett, chairman; L. H. Carlson, Norman H. Maring.

Committee on Nominations: R. H. Bainton, chairman; Wilhelm Pauck, Sidney Ahlstrom.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Annual Meetings: H. Shelton Smith, chairman; Robert Handy, Sidney Burrill, Winthrop S. Hudson, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the 1957 Spring Meeting: John Dillenberger, chairman; Sidney Ahlstrom, J. W. Brush, W. S. Hudson, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the 1958 Spring Meeting: Edgar M. Carlson, chairman; R. M. Friedmann, R. S. Michaelsen, *ex officio*.

Committee on program and Local Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting: J. R. von Rohr, chairman; Robert E. Clark, Wilhelm J. Bowsma, E. Theodore Bachman.

A stimulating and varied program of scholarly papers, including the presidential address by Quirinus Breen on "John Calvin and the Rhetorical Tradition," was enjoyed by a large attendance.

Attest:

F. A. Norwood, assistant secretary.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

December 1, 1955 - November 30, 1956

I. CURRENT FUNDS

A. SUMMARY AND BALANCE

<i>Receipts</i>		
Balance on hand, December 1, 1955		\$2,623.27
Membership Dues		\$2,508.20
Income from <i>Church History</i>		2,439.10
<i>Studies</i>		31.41
Special		128.00
		<hr/>
Total Receipts		\$7,729.98
<i>Disbursements</i>		
Expenses of management of Society		\$ 989.78
Publication of <i>Church History</i>		3,357.62
<i>Studies</i>		31.41
Special		137.20
		<hr/>
Total Disbursements		\$4,516.01
Cash on hand, November 30, 1956, in Fidelity-Philadelphia		
Trust Co. Checking account, (Bank Statement)		\$3,749.79
Less outstanding checks		535.82
		<hr/>
		\$3,213.97
		<hr/>
		\$7,729.98

B. GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

<i>Receipts</i>		
Membership dues paid		
1955 35 payments		\$ 135.50
1956 582 payments		2,320.40
1957 43 payments		52.30
		<hr/>
Subscriptions to <i>Church History</i>		\$1,717.47
Sale of copies		291.63
Advertising in <i>Church History</i>		430.00
		<hr/>
		2,439.10

MANAGEMENT OF SOCIETY

Postage and express charges		\$ 65.00
Printing and mimeographing		140.40
Stationery and supplies		18.23
Secretarial services for Secretary, treasurer		296.00
Safe Deposit box		5.50
Expenses of Secretary		131.65
Bond of Treasurer		25.00
Treasurer's stipend		300.00
Refund and returned checks		8.00
		<hr/>
		\$ 989.78

PUBLICATION OF CHURCH HISTORY

Printing and distribution of magazine		\$2,902.33
Postage and express charges		161.29
Stationery and supplies		44.23
Secretarial services		245.81
Expenses of editors		3.96
		<hr/>
		3,357.62
		<hr/>
		\$4,347.40

BOOK REVIEWS

Orthodoxi och synkretism i Sverige, 1647-1660. By SVEN GÖRANSSON. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri, 1950.

Den synkretistiska striden i Sverige, 1660-1664. By SVEN GÖRANSSON. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bolhändeln, 1952.

The history of the Swedish Church has been made the subject of both extensive and intensive research. With only one church to investigate and with only two theological faculties to supervise research into its history, it is not surprising that all of these studies bear the marks of well-planned enterprise throughout. The growing number of historical publications, many of them being doctoral dissertations, give Swedish church history a coverage which may be without equal. When more than four hundred pages of research can be devoted to four years of church life and conflict which occurred two and a half centuries ago, it is apparent that a thorough job is being done.

It is not likely that anyone except the specialized student in Swedish church history, or in the aftermath of the Thirty Year's War, or the syncretistic struggles in Germany, would be interested in knowing as much about the period as is here available for him. It is interesting to know that the limitation of official confessional status to the Augsburg Confession became a significant political advantage in Swedish international relations since it offered a wider basis of cooperation than the Formula of Concord, for instance, did. The clergy, on the other hand, were generally more favorably disposed to the Formula of Concord and appear also to have been bound by it through their ordination vows. The author points out very important differences between the syncretistic struggles in Germany and in Sweden. By about

1650 Orthodoxy had won the day in governmental circles. The author seems not to doubt that the Formula of Concord was formally approved in connection with the coronation of Charles X, following upon the abdication of Queen Christina,—a conclusion unanimously held by Swedish church historians.

The second volume deals with the Swedish counterpart to the second syncretistic struggle in Germany which centers around the efforts of Elector Frederick Wilhelm to stabilize the political situation by securing a broader backing than any single confessional position could secure for him. In the ensuing struggle between the Wittenberg theologians and the Helmstedt theologians (unionistic) the Swedish theologians moved in the direction of Wittenberg and a stricter Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the development of the concept of the modern state, resting on certain natural laws and natural rights, tended to look upon religion and the Church as a valuable asset, inasmuch as it helped to keep people contented and orderly, but not as a self-evident authority which could make claims of any sort upon the state. In particular, the theological controversy is waged between Terserus, leading representative of the Helmstedt theology, and Suenonius, a Wittenberg theologian. The volume traces this conflict in great detail.

It is likely that this is the most thoroughgoing study made of seventeenth century Swedish Orthodoxy.

EDGAR M. CARLSON
Gustavus Adolphus College

Early Christian Interpretations of History. By R. L. P. MILBURN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. 221 pp. \$3.00.

Under this title are published the Bampton Lectures delivered by Chap-

Iain Milburn of Worcester College, Oxford, in 1952. The first and last chapters deal with problems of methodology in the writing of history: the historian's task and the relative appropriateness of realism and symbolism as media of expression. In both these lectures, after a general exploration of the perennial issues of perspective, selection, and interpretation, the author finds his clue to the resolution of diverse views in the analogy of the portrait painter to the historian. Both must share the gift of vision and the discipline of technical competence. "The power of feeling to colour fact," found in pictorial art, is seen to be appropriate also to the writing of history where "selection and stress" are essential to a "clearer understanding."

Christian historiography should, Mr. Milburn believes, make good use of symbolism, endeavoring to present the meanings of life as set forth in the events of life. Greek historiography, with all its demand of eye witness testimony, ends up in contrast to the Christian in allegory, for it presupposes that events of life were too bare and too poor to exhibit in themselves the meanings of life.

The weakness of these chapters is also for the most part the basis of their value. They are a skillfully constructed mosaic of choice quotations. A casual leafing through the first chapter alone turns up over seventy gems from an impressive list of authors from Herodotus to Aldous Huxley. Mr. Milburn himself supplies very little critical comment, preferring to avoid any judgments that cannot be aptly expressed by quoting a line or two from an English poet. It may be that he has cut his discussion of historiography to suit the figures whose work he has chosen to study. Certainly they all appear at their best in this portrait of the Fathers as historians.

The lectures on Eusebius (iv) and "God's Judgment in History: Augustin, Orosius, and Salvian" (v) are the best in the series, evidencing an admirable knowledge of texts and commentaries. The earlier chapters dealing

with the second century Apologists (ii) and Origen (iii) are chiefly concerned with the interpretation of the Scripture. In both, pertinent passages relating to the writing of history have been overlooked, e.g. Irenaeus' doctrine of the progress of man and the condescension of God and Origen's detailed discussion of heuristics and methodologies in the *Contra Celsum*.

"The Treatment of History in Early Christian Art" (vi) and "Apocryphal Stories" (vii) reveal the author's special interest. Though related and informative, they seem peripheral to his main theme.

From the standpoint of the historian, and certainly also of the theologian, the appendix which recounts the historical background of the doctrine of the assumption of Mary is of great interest. The doctrine furnishes a notable instance of the development of tradition, and its study constitutes a significant contribution to the understanding of the history of religious thought. Mr. Milburn throws light upon the origin, growth, and authority of tradition, tracing the history of the myth from its rise in pious romance (pagan and Jewish as well as Christian) through the several stages of elaboration to its promulgation as doctrine and its elevation to essential dogma.

Mr. Milburn writes well, exceedingly well in places, and he writes out of a wide and appreciative acquaintance with the wisdom of the historians of antiquity and the perspectives and insights of the nineteenth century.

NOAH E. FEHL
Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Heart of Missouri. By AUGUST R. SUELFLOW. St. Louis: Concordia, 1956. xiii, 226 pp. \$1.00.

In its centennial year the "Missouri Synod" of the Lutheran Church dropped "Ohio and Other States" from its name. Prof. Walter Forster of Purdue University has called this provincialism an "unintentional touch of ironic humor" which does reflect a "conscious sense of historic value," for the name

reflects the origin and the emphasis of that church; the Saxons had made Missouri its "cradle and its capital."

Any study that deals with the Missouri area, as does *The Heart of Missouri*, will therefore shed some light on the national body which takes its name from the state. Prof. Suelflow has written a history of the Synod's Western District, 1854-1954. A conscientious chronicle of the congregations, boards, and bureaus of the highly-centralized (in Missouri) denominational group, it makes little effort at drawing its serialization of events into a meaningful unity. It will not inform the general (i.e. non-Western District) reader concerning the heart of Missouri as well as will Forster's own *Zion on the Mississippi* or Mundinger's *Government in the Missouri Synod*.

Most of the insight into Missouri origins and emphasis that it provides is rather accidentally dropped the reader's way. The national-religious tie that characterized much of its history is exemplified by the stroll of two clerics in Brunswick, Missouri, as they sought a congregation. They buttonholed all passersby who appeared to be German with, "You are surely a German and a Lutheran, are you not?" The older of the two ministers, upon accosting a Roman Catholic by this method, invited the "poor fellow" to come in any case. Mission motivation was exemplified by a letter of appeal from California: ". . . the good old Lutheran doctrine is being totally forgotten because there is no orthodox church here." The publisher's omission of a subtitle (p. 112) places "Chinese" and "Syrian" work under the heading of "English Missions." This accident may also be revealing of the early status of English work in Missouri.

Mr. Suelflow, the able Director of the Concordia Historical Institute in St. Louis, is as familiar as any living man with the documents necessary to describe the "Heart of Missouri." In this commissioned work he has located and described the heart as would an anatomist. It remains for him or someone else to account for the heart as

would a poet—or as should an historian.

MARTIN E. MARTY
Chicago, Illinois

English Monasteries and Their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century. By SUSAN WOOD. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. viii, 191 pages. \$3.40.

This excellent study in the "Oxford Historical (British) Series" observes the foundation and routine existence of religious houses under the system of thirteenth-century English patronage. These are analyzed within the feudal nexus of spiritual and temporal relationships; of the most diversified church and lay interests, whether political, economic, or social; and of typically operating canon and common law. They are set over against the daily interplay of violence and piety. The introduction lucidly focuses the main developments, necessarily quite technical, that dominate the ensuing chapters.

Patronage is first seen as property. The patron appears as the chief feudal lord or head of the monastery. In endowing a religious house he enfeoffed a tenant. Distinguishable in theory, lordship and patronage were practically indissoluble. However few the patron's rights, his existence was not forgotten. Just as English law scrutinized both its own lucrative property rights and the claims of Church law, so Canon law kept her insistence on the Church's freedom balanced with a fair regard for the secular interests of her people. The typical range of law and the exceptional ramifications of "founder," "landlord," and "advocate" in relation to such distinctive exemptions as "frankalmoin tenure" are carefully examined.

Patronage was chiefly referable to property. Hence the disputes, lawsuits, and legislation about it were necessarily matters of "advowson," affairs of the lay courts. The patron's feudal lordship and his property rights here bulk large. Electoral rights naturally predominate in the consideration of valuable property. However sharply limited his prerogatives of interference or

his inclination to exercise them, the patron's rights, being both formal and customarily recognized, provided scope for a large degree of "peaceful influence." Feudal rights to the custody of a monastery during a "vacancy" were a carefully guarded privilege. Even the briefest custodies paid well and publicized the patron's claims. These, with all their rigid limits, highlighted the restrictions on papal and other ecclesiastical rights. The typical functions of the monastery's custodian are among the better human-interest portions of the book.

The wide sweep of "useful services and incidental gains" which a patron could realize from his house marks a significant study on "Exploitation." What this meant for the monastery in sustaining the drain of official visitations and processions, alone, is enlightening. The ever pyramiding "corrodies" and other exactions are carefully treated. Connotations of a house's "credit" in excess of its actual wealth are revealingly documented.

From the standpoint of positive emphasis on the sense of spiritual corporateness existing between the patron, his family, and his religious house, one might wish that the seventh chapter were the last. Such a "Consortium" or "Confraternitas" might well be beyond all strictly feudal equation. But concluding chapters on "Protection" and "Quarrels" are equally a part of this conscientious, realistically appraised picture. Clearly enough, rights and obligations, advantages and disadvantages, had reciprocal aspects for house and patron, here, as in all feudal society.

The book in its well-written compactness, as in its documentary and bibliographical integrity, is a credit to its sponsoring scholars and institutions.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University Divinity School.

De Regno Christi, Martini Buceri Opera Latina, vol. xv, edited by FRANÇOIS WENDEL. Presses Universitaires de France and C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1955. lxx, 340 pp. 2,000 fr.

A much needed and long overdue source for Reformation studies, a critical edition of the Latin works of Martin Bucer, has begun to appear with the publication of *De Regno Christi*, edited by Professor François Wendel of Strasbourg. Professor Wendel also heads the general editorial committee for the multi-volume project, which includes Jean Rott, librarian of the Bibliothèque National et Universitaire de Strasbourg, Rodolphe Peter, director of the Séminaire protestant de Strasbourg, along with Professors Ernst Staehelin of Basel and Robert Stupperich of Münster. Professor Stupperich has published a detailed Bucer bibliography (*Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Nr. 168, Heft 2, 1952) as preparation for this edition. The writings of Bucer have never before been comprehensively collected and, according to Stupperich, bibliographies available up to the present have been "by no means complete."

Professor Wendel, well known for both Calvin and Bucer studies, introduces his text with a clear, compact and well-documented sketch of Bucer's uncomfortable exile in England, where the book was written. He then combines a summary of the contents with a penetrating critique, stressing the pragmatic, non-utopian motive behind Bucer's prescription for England's Reform, and the biblical roots of his thought. "Alone among the sixteenth century reformers, Bucer had the courage or the temerity to wish to elicit from Scripture not only his ecclesiastical organization and moral principles, but even political institutions and rules of good administration." Although Bucer was shrewdly pragmatic in his choice of problems, he was unrealistic in trying to fit an Old Testament scheme to the British monarchy in changing times, and proposed a quite un-English discipline that would have made "the Calvinist discipline at Geneva appear liberal." The introduction (written in French) describes further the existing texts and translations of *De Regno Christi*, and presents a useful outline of the subject matter. Only the sec-

tions on alms and on divorce have been translated into English, and that was during the seventeenth century.

Two manuscripts (neither in Bucer's own hand) and two early printings were the chief basis of the present text, which is equipped with a critical apparatus to show variants among these sources. Ample footnotes refer to Bucer's intellectual antecedents, to contemporary events and writings, and to numerous problems reflected in the whole range of Bucer literature. Although it remains for specialists to evaluate how well all this has been executed, it appears solidly done and formidably detailed. Appended to the edition is a large bibliography, an index of biblical passages, and a historical index. Despite the complexity of the annotations, the page format is clean and uncrowded. The print is exceedingly attractive and the paper appears durable. This fine edition of Bucer's crowning work bodes well for the coming volumes. Students of the Reformation will be able with this material to tackle anew many important problems such as the origins of Calvin's thought and the relations of the English Reform to the continent, and Bucer's own intrinsic importance, which up to now has been the province of a comparatively small number of workers.

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR.
McCormick Theological Seminary

Erasmus et l'Italie (Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance). By AUGUSTIN RENAUDET. Librairie E. Droz, Geneve, 1954. xxvii, 266 pp. 36 fr.

Professor Renaudet had already produced works we regarded as standard in the graduate schools of the 1920's. He has published three books on Erasmus (1919, 1926, 1939) and seven on subjects clearly involving Italy of the Renaissance era. Both Erasmus and the Italy of his time thus are interests of long standing with the author. That Erasmus and Italy should become the title of a book is therefore not astonishing. The book differs from Pierre de

Nolhac's *Erasme en Italie* (1898), for the latter concerns itself primarily and in detail with Erasmus' Italian sojourn, whereas the present book deals with this only in part and in no detail. It is both like and unlike Marcel Bataillon's *Erasme et l'Espagne* (1937). Erasmus had never been in Spain; though invited he refused to go because nothing there seemed attractive enough to him. Spain had no influence on him at all. On the other hand, he loved Italy, especially Rome, from which he could scarcely tear himself away. Moreover, Italians influenced him all his life, and almost to the end he tried to influence Italy. Bataillon's book pursues Erasmus in Spain exclusively through his writings, even after his death in 1536, while in Renaudet's volume the connection of Erasmus with Italy is always a living one. It is more than Italy as such; it is Italians whether in Italy or in Northern Europe. The connection is sometimes thin, for much of the material is drawn from correspondence with Northerners who were pushed one way or another by influences emanating from Italy and especially Rome.

The connection of Erasmus with Italy is shown to have begun in the schools of the Brethren of the Common Life where minds were touched by Agricola and Hegius, who in turn were inspired by Italian humanism. At Paris he found similar influences, and again in England in the persons of Colet, Linacre and More. A solid section, pp. 41-109, is given to Erasmus' visit in Italy. There he is impressed with the philological competence of the humanists on the one hand, and on the other by their general want of evangelical piety. The one was mainly epitomized by Valla's works, the Aldine circle, and the like; the other by Paduan Averroism, the mediocrity of the Roman Academy, religious skepticism among churchmen, the warlike-ness of Julius II, and such. The longest part, pp. 110-199, is devoted to Erasmus' efforts in providing Christian Europe with a better Bible (*Novum Testamentum Graece*), an up-

to-date edition of Jerome, and works like the *Institutio principis christiani*, and the *Enchiridion militis christiani*. Meanwhile he is involved in the Lutheran controversy. The last part, pp. 200-249, pertains to the problem of the third church, and is in many ways the most interesting. It describes Erasmus' desire for a church which shall be dominated neither by Protestants nor by Roman authoritarians of the kind he found to be largely anti-intellectual and political.

This last part opens with a discussion of Italian Ciceronianism. It is characterized as a twin of the sterile spirit of conformity and paganism in the church; and this is seen to be the message of the *Ciceronianus* (1528). Next are described the last years of Erasmus in which he loses hope for the success of his efforts in behalf of the third church, losing confidence not only in the efforts of his Italian well-wishers but even in Melanchthon, the broadest of the Northerners. Furthermore, some of his leading friends in Italy are taken up: Sadolet, Bembo, Egnazio, Alciati, Celio Calcagnini, and others. The influence of Erasmus was more expansive than the author's sketch indicates, and the full story waits for more detailed research. Thus Erasmus' *Ciceronianus* affected the Ferrara humanists, so that one of them (Calcagnini) wrote a criticism of Cicero's *De Officiis*. This was in turn criticized by Majoragius of Milan. When the latter in his turn became a critic of Cicero's *Paradoxon*, Marius Nizolius got involved. Nizolius attempted to show the weakness of Majoragius' defense of Cicero and how much better a defense he (Nizolius) could make. A bitter controversy ensued, which finally ended with Nizolius' *De veris principiis philosophandi* (1553), which represents a new and more dynamic Ciceronianism with which Erasmus might perhaps have been somewhat sympathetic. After dealing with the Italian friends the author takes up the anti-Erasmians of Italy: Aleander, Scaliger, Corsi, Ortenio Landi. The latter (Landi) scarcely

merits mention in this connection; though his *Cicero relegatus et revocatus* has amusing parts, it is on the whole forced.

Professor Renaudet confesses that his book is a gathering together of thoughts that grew in him during his years of Erasmus study, and that the references to his earlier works are numerous. It is indeed a fact that the bibliography is not strong in more recent studies. But the author need not apologize. His point of view of "Erasmus and Italy" is a very fruitful one. It is most easy for a book on Erasmus to suffer from diffuseness, but this one has unity. The presentation of both friend and foe of Erasmus is objective, but there is no doubt of where the author's sympathies lie. The book comes as near as any of which I know to picturing Erasmus as a man with a passion for his concept of reform of the church. He saw no sense in dissolving the Roman Catholic organization. He felt it was all-important so to strengthen the intellectual conscience of churchmen that men of his own kind might breathe freely and proudly in the church. This involved freedom for philological research even with respect to the Biblical text itself, freedom for criticism of moral perversion in the church's structure from top to bottom, and freedom for the life of simple evangelical piety without a complicated theology. Erasmus is pictured as being far from one halting between two opinions, as a fence-straddler not knowing which side to choose. His "troisième église" remains one of the abiding options.

QUIRINUS BREEN
University of Oregon.

Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Jacobean Court Preacher. By MAURICE F. REIDY, S. J. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955. xiii, 237 pp. \$3.50.

Theologian, moralist, courageous preacher before a corrupt court, controversialist by force of circumstance rather than by inclination, the link between the generation of Whitgift and

Hooker and that of Laud and the Carolines, Lancelot Andrewes is one of the heroes of Catholic Anglicanism, as he is one of the noblest figures of the post-Reformation English Church. Although several sketches of the prelate have appeared within the past half-century or so, it remained for a Jesuit scholar to give us a thorough and systematic analysis of Andrewes' thought as exhibited chiefly in his sermons, so much the vogue in his own day, but consigned to virtual oblivion by the very different literary tastes of ours. Five times reprinted in the seventeenth century, the collected sermons have been published only once since. Today Andrewes is best remembered for the immortal *Preces Privatae*, for his Latin controversial treatises are even more deeply interred than the sermons.

Fr. Reidy finds much to admire in the great Anglican, "a splendid witness to the tremendous spiritual and intellectual struggle through which the English Church labored to establish itself with a personality and character all its own"—in points akin to the Roman Church, yet not entirely parting company with the Reformers. Of this eclectic Anglicanism, Andrewes was among the chief architects and authentic representatives. We have "no other choice than to call [him] an Anglo-Catholic."

Repelled though we are by the artificialities, whimsies, and verbal conceits of Andrewes' sermon-style, the sermons yield a rich reward of doctrinal and ethical content when explored by Fr. Reidy's diligence. Thoroughly scriptural they are, but scripture as interpreted by the councils of the undivided Church and the writings of the Fathers. Andrewes is an "heir of all the Christian past." Though he may quote Augustine most frequently, his incarnational Christology is doubtless mainly dependent on the Greek Fathers. It is this high regard for "orthodoxy" and ecclesiastical tradition, combined with asceticism, that the Jesuit finds particularly attractive in Andrewes. However, it may be questioned whether it is correct to say that

in rejecting "private interpretation" Andrewes is repudiating a "prime Reformation principle," and so parting company with Luther and Calvin. On Justification he stands closer to Luther than to Trent.

Even a saint may have a weak spot—and Andrewes' weakness lay in his "saccharine adulation" of that unattractive monarch, James I. Here obsession with the Old Testament doctrine of the divine right of kings seems to have blinded the eyes and warped the judgment of a truly saintly man, whom Fr. Reidy (following T. S. Eliot) does not hesitate to compare with Ignatius Loyola as a master of the spiritual life and the techniques of meditation.

After introductory critical chapters on Andrewes as preacher and on his sermon style ("atrocious by our standards"), Fr. Reidy exhumes from its Jacobean verbiage the substantial content of his teaching on Church, Christology, redemption, grace, sacraments, moral and ascetical theology, political theory. This is a welcome work in a field worth exploring, but hitherto never systematically explored. If one were to look for originality in Andrewes one would look in vain. His abiding significance and interest for us lie precisely in the way he restored the element of Catholic—but patristic and non-Roman Catholic—thought and practice to the Anglican Church in amalgam with the valid affirmations of the Reformers. We may agree that perhaps better than either Hooker or Laud, Lancelot Andrewes "personified the new phenomenon that was Anglicanism."

PERCY V. NORWOOD
*Seabury-Western
Theological Seminary*

James Henry Rushbrooke, 1870-1947: A Baptist Greatheart. By ERNEST A. PAYNE. London: The Carey Kingsgate Press, Ltd., 1954. viii, 88 pp. 5s.

The shaping of world denominational fellowships has paralleled the emer-

gence of the Ecumenical Movement in the twentieth century. In 1905 the Baptist World Alliance was founded at London; present was the young Baptist clergyman who is the subject of this brief memoir. After the first World War, Harry Rushbrooke was called to the fulltime service of the Alliance, and continued as a conspicuous leader until his death. Dr. Payne summarizes his contribution compactly: "Rushbrooke's influence was exercised in two main directions: first in the building up of a world Baptist fellowship wider and closer than had before existed, and secondly, in the expression of strong denominational convictions and attitudes" (p. 77). In the first area, Rushbrooke emerged as a prominent defender of religious liberty; as one of his associates put it, "Much of Dr. Rushbrooke's story is embedded in the Foreign Office of Great Britain and in the Embassies and Chancelleries of Europe, but even more of that story is written in the grateful hearts of Baptists throughout the world who turned to him with expectation and never turned in vain" (p. 75). His services in the second area made him probably the most influential single figure within the Baptist community. As a representative of Baptists in various interdenominational affairs, he played the role of friendly critic. He insisted that "co-operation in the World Council, or in any other form, cannot be purchased at the cost of breaches in our Baptist fellowship" (p. 82).

Ernest Payne has told this story of a respected denominational leader (who may perhaps have been better known in this than in his own country) concisely and clearly, and with emphasis on the movements in which he participated rather than on the man himself.

ROBERT T. HANDY
Union Theological Seminary

They Seek a Country. The American Presbyterians. GAIUS JACKSON SLOSSER, editor. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955. 330 pp. \$4.75.

This book is the product of a historical symposium. It brings together thirteen chapters by fifteen scholars, some well known, on various aspects of American Presbyterianism. Three chapters are devoted to the origins of mainstream Presbyterianism in the United States. Two chapters are devoted to the United Presbyterian Church and the Reformed Presbyterian Church; five chapters are given to missions at home and abroad, education, contributions to national independence, and slavery; two chapters discuss major developments in the 19th and 20th centuries; and the final chapter presents the challenges for today and tomorrow.

While this volume has no central thesis it is marked by a definite point of view. Its interpretation of American Presbyterianism is much more in the direction of Trinterud's *The Forming of an American Tradition* than of Charles Hodge's *Constitutional History*. Its tone is quite congenial to that of Loetscher's *The Broadening Church*. No divine right Presbyterianism is presented. Emphasis is placed on the broad and tolerant scope, the freedom allowed for diversity and the progressive theological point of view.

There are abundant reasons for commending the book. It meets a real need. It tells the story in one volume of American Presbyterianism from the beginning of our country to the present, and presents the account in a readable interesting narrative that is accurate and stimulating. Its treatment of a long period and many topics is marked by brevity and considerable detail. The volume emphasizes great movements rather than chronological sequence and as a result leads to an appreciation of the life of the Presbyterian churches. Its appeal is increased by pictures, charts, notes, bibliography and index.

The most serious fault of the book is that it does not fulfill its title. It is hardly the story of all American Presbyterians. A note in the preface refers to the omission of the Cumberland Presbyterians, but no reason is given. The chapters on missions and

education, etc., concentrate, more than is to be expected, on main-line Presbyterianism. The two chapters on developments in the 19th and 20th centuries are almost exclusively devoted to the Northern Presbyterian Church. For example, there is reference to "the Presbyterian General Assembly" (p. 252) as if there were only one at the time of the First World War. And the only reference in the index to any U. S. Presbyterian in the 19th and 20th centuries is to Thomas Smyth, who is quoted on Presbyterian loyalty in the Revolutionary War.

T. WATSON STREET

Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary

Virginia Methodism: A History. By WILLIAM WARREN SWEET. Richmond: Whittet and Shepperson, 1955. xviii + 427 pp. End maps, illustrations, notes, and index. \$4.00.

In 1948 the Virginia Conference Historical Society secured the passage of a resolution by the Virginia Annual Conference to appoint a committee which would undertake the publication of a history of Methodism in Virginia. For the writing of this book the committee selected William Warren Sweet, generally recognized as the best known of American church historians.

The author devotes two chapters of *Virginia Methodism* to religion in the colony before the Revolutionary War at which time there were some three thousand members of Methodist societies in America. This survey of the early period presents the problems faced by the new church when it entered Virginia about 1766. In the years after the Revolution religion was at a low point. Methodist revivals in Virginia, beginning in 1787, led to a large increase in membership. Yet the formation of the new church and the problems of administration soon brought serious controversies and divisions. Virginia, however, was especially fortunate in the quality of men who composed the traveling ministry and rode the circuits, so admirably de-

vised to meet the need of a sparsely settled country. By 1800 the state had one-fifth of the Methodists in the United States. Yet there was little progress for some fifteen years after 1815, largely because of the War of 1812 and the steady movement of people to the west. Virginians were numerous among the immigrants, and Methodist members were probably present in larger numbers than those of any other denomination.

By 1830 slavery had entered the national picture to the extent that the North and the South were taking opposite stands on the issue. Fifteen years later the great Methodist body had divided and on May 1, 1846, the first General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, convened at Petersburg, Virginia. The Civil War exacted a heavy toll in destruction of church property and in loss of members. In the Virginia Conference the Negro membership declined from seven thousand in 1860 to about fifteen hundred in 1865. At first the church leaders were apathetic and indifferent toward advancing the Negro's status, but by the end of Reconstruction much concern was manifested over the plight of the freedman.

The Virginia Conference had doubled its membership by 1880 largely through intense evangelism. In time accommodating changes took place: the old class meeting and camp meeting gave way to the needs of a new and different social and economic order. The church accelerated its interest in a broad participation in higher education, chiefly centering its efforts in Randolph-Macon College and Randolph-Macon Woman's College. Virginia Methodists also participated enthusiastically in the temperance movement, foreign and domestic missions, and Sunday schools. Despite considerable opposition by some important leaders, the Virginia Conference supported the unification movement, which in 1939 led to the formation of The Methodist Church. Today almost the entire state is included in the confines of the Virginia Conference, whose membership exceeds 300,000. Since the founding of this con-

ference in 1782, its accomplishments in Virginia and Virginia's contribution to the whole of American Methodism constitute a significant chapter in American religious history.

This is undoubtedly the best history of Methodism in a single state yet written. On only one point would the reviewer quibble with the author. Dr. Sweet's extensive knowledge of Methodism in America has tended to overshadow Virginia in various movements, especially after 1861. Yet the planning committee requested that the book be written "in terms of movements, not of places and personalities." This request has been faithfully followed. Dr. Sweet's writing received the assistance of a committee of twelve who devoted seven years to gathering and compiling information. State histories of Methodist and other churches now have an excellent model to follow.

WALTER B. POSEY
*Agnes Scott College and
Emory University*

The Beginnings of Quakerism. By WILLIAM C. BRAITHWAITE. Second edition revised by Henry J. Cadbury. Cambridge University Press, 1955. xxviii, 607 pp. \$4.75.

Whether history must be rewritten for each generation may be tested by this re-issue, with minimal editing, of a forty-three-year-old work. Without the original introduction by Rufus M. Jones, Chapter I stands primarily as a monument to the discarded Jones-Braithwaite emphasis on connections between Friends and the Continental Anabaptist and mystical groups. Recent scholarship stresses English Puritan connections. Henry Cadbury's critical "Additional Notes," indexed, assemble the new studies—largely biographical, regional, or relating Quakerism to its background—at pertinent points starred in the text. He indicates work to be done, e.g., on Vavasor Powell, on the first missions to America, and on the Fox-Nayler controversy; he refines chronology and geography, and identifies persons. He observes that the name, "Society of Friends," has not been

found earlier than 1793, and objects to setting an arbitrary birthdate for Quakerism. The map of 92 meetings founded by 1654 is reduced to an inset. His minor footnote addenda, which do not alter the original pagination, include cross-references to Braithwaite's *Second Period of Quakerism* (1919), to be re-issued with Cadbury's notes. Since a full, new history of seventeenth century Quakerism is unlikely for another decade, scholars warned by Cadbury's notes may safely follow these old landmarks.

T. D. SEYMOUR BASSETT
Earlham College.

Church of South India: The Movement Towards Union 1900-1947.
By BENGT SUNDKLER. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954. 457 pp. \$6.75.

William Temple once commented that the emergence of the so-called younger churches, or the native Christian churches in traditionally non-Christian Asia and Africa, was the most significant fact of our century. Ironically, the strength and significance of the younger churches have tended to be overrated or underrated by Christians of the West as well as of the East. One thing is certain: the younger churches have an entirely different religious-cultural context from that of the West. In spite of the spread of secularism, a Judaeo-Christian religious background can be taken for granted in Europe and America. The younger churches are destined to live in cultures which are based on animism, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism, to name only a few. This fact has far-reaching implications which have not been fully appreciated so far.

One of the greatest problems confronting the younger churches is the fact that they are caught by two apparently contradictory movements of today's Christendom, world-wide confessionalism and the ecumenical movement. The Lutheran World Federation and Pan Anglicanism are examples of the former, and it is more than just the psychological insecurity of being

a numerical minority which drives representatives of the younger churches to participate actively in global confessional conferences, such as the Anglican Congress in Minneapolis in 1954, or regional confessional conferences, such as the All-Africa Lutheran Conference at Marangu in 1955. Considering the fact that the same confession has shown regional and national developments, world-wide confessionalism has much to offer in consolidating various trends and elements within each church family. This movement, however, seems to run counter to the second significant movement, ecumenicism however it has been conceived. Indeed, the ecumenical movement presents different sets of problems in Europe, in North America, and in Asia and Africa.

In the light of these complex problems the importance of the Church of South India may be properly seen. For this purpose, Bengt Sundkler's *Church of South India* is an important contribution to Christians throughout the world. Dr. Sundkler is Professor of Missions at Uppsala University, Sweden, and was formerly Research Secretary of the International Missionary Council. His penetrating and keen insight into the missionary situation has been demonstrated in a previous work, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa*.

In the Introduction to this book, Sundkler notes that when a church is transplanted to another soil, it changes either by willing adaptation or through its very resistance to change. Indeed, "transplantation is mutation." One result of the transplantation of churches is that:

The relation of a particular sending church to society and to other churches in the West is often very different from the relation which emerges between a particular resulting younger church and other churches in the mission field. (p. 12).

Relating this problem to the larger issue of church union, Sundkler rightly asks "how to find redemption for the wrongs of history without renouncing history?" (p. 13). Viewed from this perspective, what happened

in South India is not only relevant to an understanding of the Church of South India but also to a universal church history (p. 15).

The main theme of the book is "The Movement Toward Union, 1900-1947." Throughout the book, the author documents all the important movements and the roles played by various committees and conferences, and follows faithfully his conviction that history only comes to life when presented as an interaction and interplay of living people. It makes thrilling reading to follow the personal change, indeed personal growth, of such figures as Henry Whitehead, J. H. Maclean or V. S. Azariah. One is also struck by the fact that between 1900 and 1947 in South India, major theological and ecclesiastical issues of universal church history had to be faced—the ministry, sacraments, and above all, the nature of the church. There is a great deal of truth in the author's statement that "the real issue lay, not in Bangalore and Trichinopoly, but in Carthage and Antioch" (p. 179). Fortunately, a new turn took place in the 1930's.

According to Bartlet and Palmer, the real alternatives before the Church of South India were either Ignatian or Cyprian. The debate in the first half of the 'thirties was . . . concerned with the usual problems of church order, . . . After 1936 the tone of the negotiations changed. The main problem was no longer order but the Faith of the Church. (p. 275).

What took place with the inauguration of ecclesiastical union in 1947 is well known. It was the year of freedom, the creation of New India and the emergence of the Church of South India! Humanly speaking, one can only say that the architects of the new church stumbled into this particular form of the church. In a real sense, the new church was nurtured and brought forth by the Holy Spirit! And yet, the new church of South India is still confronted with numerous perplexing problems.

As stated before, the younger churches are caught between world-wide confessionalism and the ecumenical movement. And the regional ec-

clesiastical consolidation achieved in South India by no means solves this tension adequately. Moreover, the real theological struggle leading to church union was fought in the West more than on Indian soil. This fact makes it difficult for the Church of South India to deal with its second major problem, namely its relation to the non-Christian religion and culture in which it is destined to exist. The latter problem, which is not dealt with in Dr. Sundkler's book, should be studied by equally competent scholars in the near future.

JOSEPH M. KITAGAWA

University of Chicago

A Basic History of Lutheranism in America. By ABDEL ROSS WENTZ. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1955. viii, 430 pp. \$5.00.

It would be audacious for almost anyone except Dr. Wentz to title his history of Lutheranism in America 'basic.' It would be equally audacious for anyone to criticize Wentz' right to the use of the title. His 'basic' mastery of the story is unchallenged. He possesses the mathematician's skill at adding and subtracting and the geneticist's dexterity at untangling the generations, mutations, and hybrids that have made up Lutheran organizations from the Olive Branch Synod to the Anti-Missourian Brotherhood. He goes about telling his story with clarity and charity.

This is a narrative with a distinct viewpoint, by the author's own claim. Since it is an interpretation, the possibility of alternatives must be kept in mind. Two obvious choices have presented themselves. Wentz spends so little time in polemics that the unaware may fail to notice that his entire work is a rejection of the most familiar alternative. That is the cliché-version, common to general intellectual and religious historians. It would place Lutheranism, despite its size and success, outside the mainstream of American religion. Told thus, the denomination's life is seen first as a century-long

process from isolation and separation (caused by language, geography, temperament, and confession) to assimilation or "Americanization." Then hordes of immigrants in the Nineteenth Century forced a repetition of the entire process.

According to Wentz, Lutheranism was never so isolated nor so "Americanized" as the two poles of this account would have it. He sees the Lutheran church "not (as) an immigrant church that needed to be naturalized after it was transplanted from some European land" but as "an integral and potent part of American Christianity . . . a constituent and typical element of the American nation." (p. v)

He does not, of course, display the almost pathetic eagerness of some contemporary Lutherans to be seen as totally assimilated. Rather he speaks of a healthy reciprocity between a separate national life and a Lutheran religious life.

His commitment to this thesis provides the framework for the story's six parts. First, a parallel existed between colonialism and localism. Voluntary organization in state and church followed. After separation from European ties, which applied both to nation and church, "sectionalism was matched by sectarianism." Later, big business had its counterpart in big organization in the churches. Most recently, "the new internationalism in politics was paralleled by a new interdenominationalism in religion." Lutheranism shared in all six phases.

This parallelism will offend many readers who will not accept the assumption that similar causes operative in American state and churches produced similar effects. But in a sense this is purely formal, a convenience for telling the story, a pedagogical device for proceeding from the well-known general history of America to the less known Lutheran church history.

More important is the constant interaction which Wentz sees between Lutheranism and all phases of the American experience. The best exam-

ple of this, and most revealing to those who accept the conventional account of Lutheran isolation, is his chapter (XX) on the Civil War period. At the peak of immigration Lutherans were affecting the national issues and were being affected by them. Perhaps Wentz' stress on 'integration' accounts for his exceptional interest in recent history, when the Lutherans were, unquestionably, part of the larger Protestant pattern. Much less than one-half the book deals with the first three-fourths of the life of Lutheranism in America.

So immersed in the sources from the Lutheran viewpoint is he, and so favorably does he regard both the Lutheran and American experiences that his commitment to this interpretation is understandable. It would be most fortunate if his work could be complemented by an equally competent sophistication of the cliché-version of the same story. At worst, this approach sees Lutheranism as having made no contribution; at best, it sees a healthy dialogue between two histories, between this very large denomination and the bulk of the nation's Protestantism.

Until the stereotypes are refined into a narrative as respectable as Wentz' such a conversation between the two interpretations can be carried on only with difficulty. And there is always the possibility that Wentz' minority report is the correct one. A more dramatically radical revision of the general understanding of Lutheranism's historic position in American life than this author's own tone and claim suggest would then be in order.

MARTIN E. MARTY

Chicago

Venture of Faith: The Story of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society and the Woman's American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, 1814-1954. By ROBERT G. TORBET. Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1955. xiv, 634 pages. \$6.00.

Venture of Faith impresses the reader most of all with the intimate

relationship of foreign missions to the denominational consciousness and organization of the American Baptists. The Triennial Convention was called into being in 1814 to undertake the support of the Judsons and Rice, self-converted Baptists who felt that they must immediately resign from the American Board's mission. It was the action of the home and foreign mission agencies against the employment of slave-holding missionaries which precipitated the schism of 1845 and the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention. The Fundamentalist controversy of the 1920's to the 1940's made foreign missions the focus of its attack and led ultimately to the organization of the Conservative Baptist organs. Such storms arose over the foreign missions work of the Convention precisely because the mission continued to be the very wellspring of denominational consciousness. A reader gains the impression, however, that despite such upheavals, foreign mission interest has served as a firm foundation for the American Baptist denominational structure.

The agency was established in 1814 with the name: The General Convention of the Baptist Convention in the United States of America for Foreign Missions. It was popularly known as The Triennial Convention. Its work was carried out by the board of commissioners called The Baptist Board of Foreign Missions in the United States. After the secession of the Southerners, the Convention changed its name to American Baptist Missionary Union. The name was again changed in 1910 to American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, a name out of keeping with American missionary practice, and all the more strange because at that time the agency modified its structure as an independent society to enter into relations with the newly formed Northern Baptist Convention as its recognized board of missions. The independent missionary society has been typical of Europe and the denominational board typical of the United States. A missionary so-

society in this country ordinarily is a non-denominational mission, and usually a faith mission. Women's missionary societies arose primarily because the general church boards refused to appoint single women missionaries. They took general responsibility for special work among women and children. Cooperation with the denominational boards gradually led to their elimination as sending organizations and to the assumption of auxiliary status. Various regional women's societies, the first of which was organized in 1871, entered into a process of cooperation and then merger led to a single Woman's Baptist Foreign Missionary Society in 1914. Within the past year the A.B.F.M.S. and the W.A.B.F.M.S. have been integrated. Torbet's book, which was commissioned by both societies, therefore comes at an opportune time as a summary of the work of the two agencies.

The author has brought to this task historical scholarship, personal authority in the realm of Baptist history, intimate experience with denominational machinery, and a devotion to the mission. He has woven an immense amount of detail into a very interesting and readable narrative, and he has produced what will long be the standard history of the first one hundred forty years of American Baptist missions. *Venture of Faith* is a book written in the usual tradition of denominational mission history, that is, it is the story of a denominational mission without relating that denominational activity to the total Protestant missionary enterprise at every stage. The denominational story has a right to full treatment, but it cannot be accurately seen and appraised in isolation. Although each board has acted in sovereign independence, actually it has almost invariably shaped its program within a pattern common to all American foreign missionary agencies, and, indeed, largely common to the entire Protestant missionary enterprise. Consequently, even a book as well written and as scholarly competent as *Venture of Faith* suffers

grave limitations when not related constantly to the larger context. The author is aware of this larger scene, and here and there, and especially at the very beginning, some pages are given to trends and movements and the relation of these to the Baptist program. These are insufficient to give the average Baptist reader an understanding of this vital relationship.

Home base administrative history and field developments are skilfully woven into a unified narrative. Outstanding personalities, beginning with Adoniram Judson, become living figures, and the roles of scores of less conspicuous persons are made clear. Controversies are not left hidden, but are dealt with fairly and with objectivity, clarity, and restraint. Examples are Mrs. Mason's aberrations which led to schism and the entrance of the Anglican S.P.G. into Karen work, the independent Karen mission and the unhappy results of the Deputation of 1853, and the Fundamentalist attacks on the Society. It is fascinating to follow developing policy or lack of policy with respect to the emerging indigenous churches. Baptist autonomy on the whole does not seem to have afforded any wiser insights with respect to the planting and growth of young churches than other denominations with more centralized control. It is significant that although insistence on believers' baptism kept American Baptists out of church union on mission fields, they have supported cooperation in most loyal fashion and have been willing to work through union institutions.

The great Burma Mission, mother of a Christian community of about half a million members and adherents, and including Burmans, Karens, Chins, Kachins, Shans, Muhsos, Talaings, Eurasians, Chinese, and Indians, is in a sense the chief "heroine" of the story; and no better demonstration can be found of the power of God to reconcile diverse peoples to Himself in Christ. Yet the story of the approach to China through Siam, the entrance into China, and the work in Assam,

Bengal-Orissa, south India, Japan, the Philippines, and Congo are just as interesting and significant. All Christians, not just Baptists, will find inspiration in the story of Karen initiative in self-support and evangelism, the transformation of head-hunters in the Naga Hills, the struggle of the Telugu Mission out of adversity and seeming defeat, and many another chapter of A. B. F. M. S. work. There is a very useful bibliography.

R. PIERCE BEAVER
University of Chicago

The Presbyterian Enterprise, Sources of American Presbyterian History. Edited by MAURICE W. ARMSTRONG, LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER, and CHARLES S. ANDERSON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956. 336 pp. \$4.50.

The observation of the 250th anniversary of the organization of the first Presbytery to be established in America (formed in Philadelphia in 1706) has been the inspiration for the publication of a number of articles, pamphlets, and books bearing on the history of Presbyterianism in the United States. This volume under review is the most scholarly and therefore the most important of these recent contributions to Presbyterian history. Three well qualified historians have collaborated in the preparation of this work—Dr. Armstrong is on the faculty of Ursinus College; Dr. Loetscher is from Princeton Theological Seminary; and Dr. Anderson is in charge of the Presbyterian Historical Society.

The selections included in this volume have been taken from 171 documents which cover the past 250 years of Presbyterianism in America. Only American documents were taken. The selections are well balanced to illustrate the three great periods of Presbyterian history—(1) Colonial Presbyterianism, 1706-1783; (2) American Presbyterianism in Mid-Passage, 1784-1869; and (3) Recent Presbyterianism, (1870-1956). The introductions to each quotation are especially clear and helpful.

This book will hereafter be a basic source of Presbyterian history and will be especially helpful to serious-minded students who need a guide to their study. The selections here presented give a first-hand and intimate glimpse into the contemporary scene. The volume contains the important documents which anyone acquainted with Presbyterian history would expect, as the Plan of Union of 1801, the Auburn Affirmation of 1924, and also many selections from documents which are relatively unknown or not easily available. The selections deal not only with the theological problems which disturbed the life of the church from time to time but also with the reaction of the church to such great issues as the fight for religious freedom, slavery, the frontier, war, missionary expansion, civil rights, etc. This is a most helpful volume.

CLIFFORD M. DRURY
San Anselmo Theological Seminary

Through the South and the West with Jeremiah Evarts in 1826. Edited by J. ORIN OLIPHANT. Lewisburg, Penn.: Bucknell University Press, 1956. 143 pp. Paper, \$2.60.

This small book is divided into two parts—"The World of Jeremiah Evarts" (pp. 1-62) and "Letters and Journal of Jeremiah Evarts" (pp. 63-143). In the first part Professor J. Orin Oliphant has written an excellent biographical sketch of the noted Evarts covering the fifty years of his life. The major emphasis is devoted to Evarts' travels in the South in the interest both of his health and of missions to the Indians. By this introduction adequate background is supplied for a clear understanding of the material covering Evarts' tour. This is composed of letters and a journal written between January 23, 1826, on board a vessel sailing from Boston to Charleston, and July 1, 1826, after he had returned to his home in Boston. The editing is carefully done; over three hundred footnotes indicate the aid given the reader.

One of the founders of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Evarts served as its treasurer from 1821 to 1822 and as its corresponding secretary from 1821 until his death ten years later. On four previous trips to the South, Evarts had become so familiar with the country that on his fifth trip he found new territory only from Memphis up the Mississippi and Ohio rivers. As he journeyed he grieved over the treatment of the Indians and prayed that Negro slavery would be gradually abolished. He was generous, however, toward the South.

He believed that the world would soon be genuinely evangelized and that America would become the leader in a world-wide conversion to Christianity. As a profound Christian, a great religious leader, and a stalwart champion of the rights of Southern Indians, Evarts deserves to be much better known. To that end Professor Olyphant has made a splendid contribution.

WALTER B. POSEY

*Agnes Scott College
and Emory University*

Brewer Prize Contest

As previously announced, the American Society of Church History is again conducting a contest for a book-length manuscript in the field of church history. The award will consist of a grant of one thousand dollars to assist in the publication of the winning manuscript. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form of the original and first carbon must be in the hands of the secretary of the Society by September 15, 1957.

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

Volume 12

Complete texts, with commentary, on *James - Revelation*. Indexes to the set; 16 pages of color photographs; 3 general articles, one on the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Early Summer.* \$8.75

HEBREW MAN

Ludwig Köhler. The thought, religion, folkways, physical appearance of biblical people. By the retired principal and professor of Old Testament, University of Zurich. \$2.50

A SURVEY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

W. W. Sloan. A college text written to stimulate an investigative attitude toward Bible study. With reading lists, names to remember, assignments at end of each chapter. \$3.50

MODERN SCIENCE AND CHRISTIAN BELIEFS

Arthur F. Smethurst. Exploring the compatibility of science and religion. The author, Canon Residentiary of Salisbury Cathedral, is a well-known British scientist. \$4

THE MESSAGE OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Eric L. Titus. A section-by-section commentary, assuming the Gospel of John to be an *interpretation* of Jesus, rather than a historical account of his life. \$3.50

THE INEVITABLE CHOICE

Edmund Davison Soper. Shows how the Vedanta philosophy threatens Western Christianity, and how Christianity is superior to all other religions. \$2.50

THE CHRISTIAN AND THE WORLD OF UNBELIEF

Libuse Lukas Miller. A comprehensive critique of modern culture—a Christian interpretation of science, philosophy, ethics, social science, and history. \$4.75

THE INTEGRITY OF PREACHING

John Knox. The Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature, Union Theological Seminary, demonstrates why biblical preaching is the most relevant for our time. \$1.75

AT ALL BOOKSTORES



abingdon press

THE DRAMA OF CHURCH HISTORY AS WELL AS THE FACTS

The Ministry in Historical Perspectives

Edited by

H. RICHARD NIEBUHR and
DANIEL D. WILLIAMS

EIGHT outstanding American church historians comment penetratingly on nine great epochs in the history of the ministry and what they mean to the church today.

The Ministry in the Primitive Church	- - - - -	by JOHN KNOX
The Ministry of the Ante-Nicene Church	- - - - -	by GEORGE WILLIAMS
The Ministry in the Later Patristic Period	- - - - -	by GEORGE WILLIAMS
The Ministry in the Middle Ages	- - - - -	by ROLAND H. BAINTON
The Ministry in the Time of the Continental Reformation	- - - - -	by WILHELM PAUCK
Priestly Ministries in the Modern Church	- - - - -	by EDWARD R. HARDY
The Ministry in the Puritan Age	- - - - -	by WINTHROP HUDSON
Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America: 1607-1850	- - - - -	by SIDNEY E. MEAD
The Protestant Ministry in America: 1850 to the Present	- - - - -	by ROBERT MICHAELSEN
		\$5.00

The Holy Fire

By ROBERT PAYNE

"THIS powerfully written book [the story of the fathers of the Eastern Church] sets out to help the Western man understand the thinking which has affected the entire Christian world in that world's best moments, and the beauty of the devotions which the Eastern Church has given to the worship of all Christian communions.

The book takes up, in turn, the lives (when known) and contributions of outstanding Fathers of the Near East. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Dionysius the Areopagite, John Damascene, and Gregory Palamas are all treated with discernment and affection. If I have persuaded anyone to buy and read this book, I shall have succeeded in conveying my profound admiration both of the book and of its author."—Edward N. West, Canon Sacrist, Cathedral of Saint John the Divine.

\$5.00

At your bookseller **HARPER & BROTHERS, N. Y. 16**

Rand McNally
is pleased to announce

THE RAND MCNALLY

BIBLE ATLAS

by Emil G. Kraeling

Professor Emeritus, Union Theological Seminary
and Columbia University

Though the sacred scriptures of the Jews and Christians are read mainly for their moral and religious content, they may also be read for what they tell us of the localities and events to which they relate. The Rand McNally Bible Atlas puts these places and events into geographical perspective.

The Rand McNally Bible Atlas contains 22 chapters of text material, 22 color maps, and over 50 illustrations. The uses of the Atlas are manifold. It may be used as a reference book in religion, history, and archaeology classes. As an adjunct to Bible study, it is indispensable.

College Department
Rand McNally & Company

Table of Contents

Section One
The Land of the Bible

Section Two
The Ancient Hebrew Tradition

Section Three
The Promised Land

Section Four
The Great Kings

Section Five
The Divided Kingdom

Section Six
Babylon to Jerusalem

Section Seven
The Time of Jesus

Section Eight
The Growth of Christianity

TEXT—Over 400 pages of comprehensive information imparting a contemporary picture of the geography and history of the Bible.

MAPS—40 pages of full color maps.

47 black and white maps and plans

Many photographs and illustrations

7 x 10—488 pages

Price \$6.75

(for college class use)

P.O. Box 7600—Chicago 39

This book gives a history of
the Central American C.
tive and its work.

**The History of the Foreign
missions to Central America and the
Forward of the Central American
Mission during the last 100 years**

**The dispensation of
the Lord in the
lives of many
holy men and
famous churches
in the
Presbyterian Church**

**Some insight is given
into the history of
periodicals, and
volume, annual
of the
Presbyterian Church**

**Handsome bound
price \$150 net postpaid**

THE HISTORY

OF THE
CENTRAL AMERICAN
MISSION

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE DISPENSATION

OF THE LORD

IN THE LIVES

OF MANY HOLY MEN

AND FAMOUS CHURCHES

IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE PERIODICALS

AND VOLUMES

ANNUALS

OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE HANDBOOKS

AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE ANNUALS

AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE ANNUALS

AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

WITH A HISTORY OF

THE ANNUALS

AND BIBLIOGRAPHIES

OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

BY JAMES W. COOPER

HISTO

RY

Y

Y

Y

Y